10105

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 5, 1899.

The Week.

The news from Manila which tells of the surrender of Iloilo to the insurgents, and of a new and strong cabinet formed by Aguinaldo, is supplemented by news from Washington that President McKinley is thinking of sending a commission to the Philippines to study the conditions there, and to make recommendations as to the policy to be pursued in dealing with the islands. Gen. Merritt, who is now at Chicago, is reported as strongly disapproving the act of the Spanish Gen. Rios in surrendering to the insurgents, unless he (Rios) was compelled to do so by hunger or other *force majeure*. A fortnight ago the newspapers contained another remonstrance from Agoncillo, the diplomatic agent of the Filipinos, against the annexation of the islands to the United States. He argued strongly that Spain had nothing to cede in the Philippines; that her claims were annulled long before the Paris conference took place, and that since her pretended sovereignty had been overthrown she had nothing either to sell or to give away. If we add to this that the American troops in the islands are many of them suffering from climatic diseases, that they are pining to come home, and that their relatives are sending petitions to members of Congress every day for their discharge, and that the new army bill is not passed, we have a condition that may be rightly called a muddle. Nor is it likely that the conditions will simplify themselves with the lapse of time.

No illusion should be entertained about the antecedents and probable aims of the men of mixed blood who are now at the head of the so-called Philippine republic. Their patriotism has been, in the past, of too glaringly a mercenary character to make it easy to believe it now entirely disinterested. Most of them were concerned—certainly Aguinaldo was—in the famous treaty of Biacnabató, which was negotiated by Governor-General Primo de Rivera on December 14, 1897. This treaty was simply a contract for bribery on a gigantic scale. The sum semi-officially divulged in Spain was $5,000,000. Of this, Aguinaldo's share was $400,000, in consideration of which he agreed to waive his love of liberty and independence, and retire to Hong Kong, as he did. There may be more or less uncertainty about these figures, but there is none about a document which one of the Philippine insurgent leaders sent to Spain, and which was read openly before the Cortes. He was one Pedro Paterno, afterwards elected President of the native Assembly, who informed the Spanish Government last February that the treaty of peace through bribery was due to his labors with the insurgent chiefs. He enclosed a bill for his services—namely, $1,000,000, a dukedom of Castile for himself, and a Spanish title of Count for his brother. Later he issued an appeal to the islanders to cast their lot with Spain against the American invaders. The conversion of this man into a stern republican is a trifle sudden.

Nobody yet knows how large a part of the army must prepare for foreign service, or how long those regiments now in Manila or Cuba or en route must stay there. In the English army 102,000 men are kept abroad, each regiment being sent home for seven years after it has passed a like period in India, South Africa, or Egypt; and the draughts upon the 117,000 home troops for recruits to take the places of those incapacitated or killed by disease abroad have been so great as to cause the War Office much concern, and to lead to a large increase of the army as well as a partial reorganization. Our regiments are going across the seas with no home battalions to supply them during their absence with the fresh victims ever demanded, even of a conquering army, by the conqueror of all. Our War Department and generals, throwing away a rare opportunity for reform, have clung to a vicious, out-of-date staff system, and to numerically weak regiments, while making entrance to the commissioned offices free for all men without fitness and with pulls. The forty-seven regiments we are to have when Mr. Hull's bill passes in a month or two will, in all probability, not begin to supply the military needs of Cuba, Porto Rico, the Philippines, and our own unsettled West, even with native auxiliaries to fall back upon, if our regulars are to have the boon of coming back to civilization at stated intervals. If we retain these island dependencies, we may count upon yearly assaults upon Congress for more soldiers as well as for more ships. It has been and is so the world over. Our Mahans and our Mileses, because of their training, will see new dangers every twelvemonth or oftener. Each island must be fortified, and must have its trained garrison to protect its flag. For the country that has once set its face squarely towards militarism and military governments there is no stopping. Does not Germany alone prove this?

The wage-workers of the United States have been slow in realizing that the annexation of the islanders of the East and West Indies brings them face to face with something akin to Chinese cheap labor, and that they will not be able to resist it when it comes in that form. They seem now, however, to be waking up to the fact. On Saturday week the Central Labor Union of New York passed, with only one dissenting vote, resolutions against expansion. On Thursday evening last the similar organization at Boston took similar action, recording its "emphatic protest against the policy of imperialism now being shaped as the result of a war undertaken in the alleged name of humanity." In some parts of the country, resolutions have been passed by workingmen expressing the belief that annexation of the Philippines is a part of a capitalistic scheme to bring about a reduction of wages. We do not think that there is any ground for this suspicion, but we agree with the Boston Central Labor Union that, if such a result should follow, it would aggravate industrial discontent to a dangerous degree. As surely as the Philippines are annexed, whatever the forms of annexation may be, and however we may seek to guard against the admission of their inhabitants to the present United States, they will find their way hither, and they cannot be kept out except by trampling under foot the foundation principle of the republic, which is the equality of all citizens under the law.

Ex-Secretary Day, in his speech on Monday night at Canton, surpassed all rivals, and they are many, in fulsome adulation of the President. He said of him that he could "not forbear an expression of satisfaction that the verdict of his countrymen, no less than the approving judgment of the world, gives him first place among the great men who have filled that high office." Shovel on the flattery thick, was Disraeli's cynical account of the way he came to stand so high in the Queen's favor; and we have seen a sickening amount of such shovelling, done in the most ostentatious way, by men who wanted something from Mr. McKinley. Mr. Day speaks as a man who has had something, and is squaring the account by this public fawning. It is not only a disgusting business, but a thing most demoralizing to public manners and morals. What becomes of our historic sense, of our standards of judgment, to say nothing of good taste and even decency, if we are to be called upon every day or two to fall down and worship a man whose life has been before the country for twenty-five years, and who never, in all that time, displayed a single first-rate quality of intellect or character? If he were half the great man his flatterers trumpet before him

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that he is, the first thing he would do would be to bid them be still, for very shame's sake. A really great man in the Presidency would never let it even be imagined that the way to get office from him was to cover him with obsequious flattery; and if he caught the editor of the *Tribune* trying it on, he would say to him, as the Duke of Wellington said to a man singing his praises to his face, "Don't be a d——d fool!"

Señor Romero, the Ambassador of Mexico, whose death occurred last week, represented his country so long at Washington city, and made himself so much liked both there and elsewhere, that he seemed almost like one of our own citizens. He was long the Dean of the diplomatic corps, the social functions of which position he discharged in a charming manner. He was a frequent visitor to New York, and a welcome guest among all those who had the pleasure of acquaintance with him. He first came to Washington as Secretary of Legation in 1859, and was soon afterwards made Chargé d'Affaires. He returned home to fight the French when they invaded his country, and was appointed Minister at Washington when the government of Maximilian came to an end. He was also Secretary of the Mexican Treasury for a short time. Thus his diplomatic service was of nearly forty years' duration, and would have been quite so but for the interruptions mentioned above, which were voluntary on his part. His long official sojourn among us teaches that a diplomatic career, as distinguished from appointments made by the rules of chance and luck and party spoils, is not impossible or unbecoming in a republic, and that the best results of international intercourse are to be obtained when the diplomatic office seeks the man, and when it finds him holds him. Usually the importance of a Minister is in exact proportion to the importance of the country he represents, but it was not so in Romero's case. He added to the importance of his country in the eyes of the Government and people to whom he was accredited.

The difficulty which Governor Roosevelt is experiencing in finding a really first-rate man who is willing to accept the position of Superintendent of Public Works, calls attention anew to one of the most radical defects of our system of government. If we had permanent tenure during good behavior for all such places as this, we could then pay a sufficient salary to make it possible to obtain the very best talent for the public service; but so long as the term of service is limited by political changes in the Government, it would be folly to raise the salaries above their present limit, for to do so would have no other effect than to make more furious the pursuit of the politicians for possession of them. A Governor of the Roosevelt type could be depended upon to fill them well, but one of the Black type would put Aldridges and Payns into them, and the only result would be that the State would pay expert prices for very bad service. Large salaries with uncertain tenure would not make the positions much more attractive to really desirable talent than they are now, for few experts would be willing to give up permanent private employment for two years' employment by the State, with a prospect of constant annoyance during that period and dismissal at its close. Col. Waring's experience in this city is typical of what a really desirable man is called upon to do when he is asked to take a public office in which expert ability is desired. He gave up a private business which brought him in something like $20,000 a year, in order to serve this city for $6,000 a year. He served the city in a way as nearly perfect as any official anywhere has ever done. There was absolutely no question of the faithfulness, success, and incalculable value of his work. What was the result? He was turned out of his place with as little ceremony or even decent respect as if he had failed utterly. His salary had been so inadequate for his very modest demands that a fund had to be raised after his death for the support of his family.

Col. Roosevelt caused the machine keen disappointment last week by appointing Lieut.-Col. Avery D. Andrews Adjutant-General of the National Guard. Even though that office has lost much of its former importance because of the new military code about to go into effect, the Governor-elect's readiness to place the disposal of its not inconsiderable patronage and moneys in the hands of an independent Democrat must be taken as highly significant of his determination to appoint to office the very best men available, without regard to the likes or dislikes of the party bosses. As a graduate of West Point, who has served almost continuously in the regular army and the State militia for the last twelve years, Gen. Andrews is in every way fitted for the duties of his position, while his excellent record as a Police Commissioner, and the independence of his attitude on all the questions which came up before the Police Board during his term of service, are guarantees that his new office will be administered with an eye single to the interests of the State and to the advancement of its military forces. Thus the National Guard enters upon the brightest year in its history under a sensible and progressive code of laws, and under the leadership of two trained and able soldiers, Gens. Roe and Andrews, who have the vigorous aid and hearty support of the first Governor in many years to possess military tastes and knowledge. The change has come none too soon. Under the wretched military administration now passing from office and its present incompetent and political Adjutant-General, the State force has sunk low indeed. Its war record is tarnished by serious charges of cowardice and inefficiency, its armories have become primarily breeding-places of dissensions and scandals, and its entire condition is distempered and disordered. For it the dawn of good government has come at the darkest hour.

At first thought, the proposal of Mr. Croker to start an insurance company seems to be somewhat inexplicable, but when you come to consider the matter for a moment, you will see that there may be something in it after all. He started a club, and it has become a roaring success. He has started a surety company, and that is doing a fine business—how fine, nobody knows so well as the Platt Family Surety Company which gave Mr. Croker the idea. Both these Croker institutions owe their prosperity to the same basic fact—that everybody who wishes to stand well with the ruler of the city must join the one and do business in bonds with the other. Why may not the same principle be applied to the insurance business? If you want any favors from Tammany Hall, any nominations for office, any contracts, any places for yourself and friends—want, in short, to fortify and fructify your worldly fortunes by means of the Croker pull, why should not a good policy on your life in the Croker Life Insurance Company (Limited) be a sure way of doing this for you? In fact, so long as the Croker "pull" is the inexhaustible and irresistible source of power that it is at present, why should it not be made the working capital of business of all kinds? With an annual budget of $100,000,000 behind it, with an enormous list of places to fill as the boss wishes, and with all the corporate wealth of the city as a mine from which to draw contributions, the resources of the "pull" are as near boundless as anything in the way of capital that the modern world has seen.

The practical disfranchisement of the blacks in Alabama and other Southern States, through the device of constitutional changes, is urged for various reasons, among others that the elimination of this element will enable the whites to divide their votes in safety, as they cannot now do. Thus the Savannah (Ga.) *News* recently asserted that, "if the menace of the black vote were removed, there would be two parties of white voters in all of the Southern States, and there would be just as much interest in Southern State elections as there is in an election in Vermont or any other State." But this theory is not sustained

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the experience of Mississippi, which was the first State to adopt the new policy. The colored vote was practically got rid of there eight years ago, and yet the whites show far less interest in elections now than they did before the change. The extraordinary situation which now exists is strikingly portrayed by the Vicksburg *Herald*, as follows:

"The restrictions and what preceded them have completely enervated the electoral body. Habituated to dependence upon organization for so many years for protection, when the peril of negro debasement is removed we find that the surrender to party absolutism has become second nature. The primary or the convention having spoken, the election is a mere formality. This is a realization of what Mr. Evarts, in the Senate debate upon our Constitution in 1891, called 'a desiccated suffrage.' The resulting political status is not democracy, it is oligarchy. But it is better than that from which we escaped. Still, does Georgia—which has not the depth and degree of negroism that we had—wish it?"

For more than a year a railroad-rate case of special interest has been pending before the United States courts. The North Dakota Railway Commissioners in May, 1897, adopted a schedule of rates for the railways operating in that State, which involved a reduction from existing charges of about 14 per cent. For refusing to publish the new schedule, or for disregarding it, the penalties were very severe; but the railroads applied for an injunction from the United States court to restrain the publication of the rates, thus bringing up the whole question of their reasonableness. This was elaborately argued for and against the State's contention, and a decision was finally handed down last week sustaining the railways. Judge Amidon, District Judge for Dakota, and Judge Thayer of St. Louis, sitting with him, found that the proposed rates would not have yielded a sufficient return to pay for the cost of handling the traffic, that they were therefore unreasonable, and that the order restraining their publication should be continued. To the lay mind this doctrine of "reasonableness" seems in conflict with the one laid down by the Supreme Court in the pooling case, in which it was held that a law of Congress need not be reasonable in order to be binding. But as North Dakota will probably appeal its own case to the Supreme Court, we shall find out in time if there is a conflict or not. Meanwhile, the decision of the District Court is a severe blow to the railway-harriers of the West.

Imperial penny postage took a long stride onward on Christmas Day, when the English Postmaster-General announced a list of some forty-five British possessions, including India, to which the letter-postage is hereafter to be one penny the half-ounce, instead of the present rate, 2½d. This is the result of prolonged agitation, led of late years by Mr. Henniker Heaton, and of many conferences between colonial governments and delegates and the imperial authorities. The final upshot was an agreement that all those parts of the British empire which desired to have penny postage between themselves should be allowed to do so. Australia and Cape Colony do not as yet see their way clear to join the movement, on account of the expense of carrying letters inland; but all the other great colonies have now availed themselves of the privilege. This is a form of imperial federation and expansion which everybody must approve, except those who insist upon making expansion mean fighting. If empire meant solely the free exchange of ideas, as of goods, it would seem very tame to some of our military romancers, but it would really be empire at its best. There is a temporary expense involved, as a postal deficit will have to be made good for a time. This should recommend it to the expansionists, who fairly dote on expense. Yet our expansive Postmaster-General drew back from the proposal that penny postage should be established between the United States and Great Britain, on the ground that we could not afford it. We are spending so much on guns and ships and policing our empire that we have nothing left to pay postage.

Lord Salisbury, in his speech to the Constitutional Club on December 16, put in his neatest manner the difficulty of mixing the new diplomacy with the old. The cry of the new diplomats is that you must take the people into your confidence. Very good; but how can you take them into your confidence without taking everybody else in too—including the foreign nation with which you may have some delicate negotiation in hand, and to which you do not care to blurt out all your case? Lord Salisbury said he had always preferred greater reticence, but some of his colleagues had not taken the same view. But what had been the result of their attempts to lift the veil? Why, they had been instantly denounced for using indiscreet and provocative language. There is the dilemma. "If you want discretion and reticence, you may have it; but if you want the reverse of reticence, whatever it may be, you cannot expect to have what you consider to be discretion." Therefore, any unlucky Minister who ventured to speak at all about foreign relations was certain to be charged with indiscretion, or else charged with the more heinous crime of not taking the people into his confidence. Chamberlain and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach and Sir Edmund Monson will read this gentle raillery with mixed feelings; but it certainly gives plausibility to the rumor that Salisbury is tiring of the cares of the Foreign Office, and that his throwing the reins so often on the necks of his subordinates is but preliminary to getting off the box altogether.

The same speech contained some sentences which certainly support the view of "Diplomaticus" in the *Fortnightly*, on which we recently commented. This was, that it was the knowledge of the threatening French conspiracy in Africa which tied the Prime Minister's hands in Armenia and in China. As if precisely to bear this out, Lord Salisbury said: "It may be quite true that there are some matters on which you do right to go to war, and yet the extreme step was not taken, but you must be sure before you take that action that there were no other possible or immediate complications within view which made it necessary to economize the force that was at the disposal of the Government." He also maintained that a government should be judged as a merchant would be who had failed in some enterprises, but succeeded in others, the failure being excusable by the necessity of reserving all his capital "for work that he knew was impending upon him, and of which he knew that all his capital was necessary for the success." This was only a diplomatic way of saying that the Foreign Office had to lie down in Turkey and China in order to be able to checkmate France at Fashoda.

The *Journal des Économistes* has a sad story to tell about French commerce and colonial policy, apropos of the Fashoda affair. Inquiring what can be the cause of the English feeling of irritation towards France, it attributes it to the operation of the Méline tariff on the commercial relations of the two countries. Under the treaties of commerce the exportations of England into France amounted to 665,000,000 francs; under the Méline tariff they have declined to 485,000,000 in 1896; while the French imports into England have risen, through English free trade, to 1,335,000,000, an increase of 300,000,000. More mischievous than this, the *Journal* thinks, is the French practice of closing to foreign commerce all her new colonial possessions. In 1880, under the treaties of commerce, the French foreign trade amounted to 8,500,000,000 francs; in 1897, under the Méline tariff, it has sunk to 7,554,000,000. The French exports to Algeria amount to 100,000,000 francs. This is the exact cost of the defence and administration of the colony, per annum. In other words, the taxpayers of France pay the profits of the French exporters, and this sixty years after the acquisition of the colony. There are among us a good many low "kickers" and grumblers, who predict exactly the same results for our colonization—that is, the payment, through the cost of defence and administration, by the taxpayers of the American exporters' profits. We are on the way to that glorious result already, and would advise that the persons who call attention to it be sent out of the country.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DEMOCRATIC WARS.

Mr. Charles J. Bonaparte read, at the meeting of the Civil-Service Reform Association, a fortnight ago, a very powerful paper in answer to the question, apropos of the events of the late war: Can we trust our army to spoilsmen? No more trenchant exposure of the levity and imbecility which marked our military operations has yet appeared, and we are glad to see that it has been reprinted in pamphlet form. But Mr. Bonaparte has to begin his observations, as most writers have to-day, by showing that he does not disapprove of war in general, or believe, with Gen. Sherman, that "war is hell!" or that Washington was a "Beelzebub," or that the men who fought at Bunker Hill, Saratoga, and Yorktown were "demons in training." What Gen. Sherman undoubtedly meant, and had to mean, was that war was as near a reproduction of the hell of the theologians as man could produce here on earth, which is strictly true. Any one who denies it cannot have seen war. War involves a complete dissolution of the ordinary bonds of civil society, and an abrogation of most of the rules of morality. What else could man do to imitate the state of things in the kingdom of Satan? Literal reproduction of hell is not within our reach. We cannot command lakes of fire, and eternal torments, with three-pronged forks, but we inflict all the tortures of which we are capable, and to-day thousands of our best minds are busy improving the means of killing and maiming human beings and destroying the material results of civilization over large areas, so as to make the lot of the inhabitants as unhappy as possible. What else is Satan's regular business?

This part of Mr. Bonaparte's address is, in fact, what we call rhetorically "the placatory clause" which most of our writers have to use in order to secure a patient hearing from a public not accustomed to plain logic. Mr. Bonaparte says he addresses "those of my fellow-countrymen (numbering, in my opinion, certainly nine out of every ten of them) who have no longing for wars or conquests, and view with distrust and misgiving our adoption of a meddlesome, visionary foreign policy which leads to these, but who know that, while men remain neither better nor worse than men, there will be times when the sword must be drawn, and know, moreover, that often it can remain in the scabbard because, and only because, it is, and is known to be, sharp and ready to the hand which shall wield it." We presume he also addresses "many thousands of our young men who left their homes for a war which, as I have reason to think, a large majority deemed unnecessary and unwise. In their cheerfulness and obedience under privations, all the harder to bear because plainly needless, and in the steadiness and gallantry displayed by substantially all of them who went into action, I see, perhaps, the most encouraging and healthful symptoms of our national life."

As Mr. Bonaparte's thesis is simply that a nation should not go to war without preparation, he is, doubtless, not called on to discuss the proper causes or proper time to go to war. But so strangely constituted is the human mind that *we* see in this readiness of young men to take the field in person in "a war which a large majority deemed unnecessary and unwise," not a "most encouraging and healthful symptom of our national life," but a dangerous one. There could not be a better illustration than the late war, as Mr. Bonaparte describes it, of the enormous danger and barbarism of any war, except a plainly defensive one, for a democracy like ours. The war with Spain was, he admits, "unnecessary and unwise," and, therefore, frightfully wicked. It was more than usually wicked because we were entirely unprepared for it, and, therefore, it promised great loss of life among our own people, and great injury to the health of our young men, without any compensatory damage to the enemy.

Now, who got up this "unwise and unnecessary war" and hastened its outbreak? A small set of distrusted politicians at Washington known to Mr. Bonaparte as the "spoilsmen"—that is, men without much conscience or honor or real patriotism, for whom these young men, who went into the field so readily, had no respect in private life. But, by an old monarchical tradition, these spoilsmen were, for the time being, "the country," and, therefore, at liberty to launch Christian men, without inquiry, into any enterprise they chose to designate as "patriotic," as if man was not a moral being before he became a citizen, or ceased to be one after he became a citizen. An American citizen has still, in the nineteenth century of the Christian era, to follow our politicians to their wars, as Englishmen had to "follow the king to his wars" in the fifteenth century, without any inquiry as to what the war was about.

The belief that a wish on the part of a politician for war gives him a claim on your life and property and health which you are bound to honor, without question as to cause, or preparation, or prospect of success, is to us one of the greatest dangers of modern democracy. In the sixteenth and seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when the kings were, like Louis XIV., held to be entitled, if they enjoyed war, to ruin their countries with it, the evil was in some degree, as we pointed out the other day in connection with Taine's comments on the Napoleonic conscription, mitigated by the fact that wars were carried on by voluntary enlistment. The people who were carrying on the work of civilization in their various occupations were not held bound to leave them, that the king and the court might see them march and counter-march, and open trenches, and die miserably, for their entertainment. Most of their victims were men to whom no better lot was open. But as the tradition has come down to us, anybody who can secure a nomination, or even buy it, can call for the flower of our youth for a hopeless conflict, as the Venezuela war would have been, or for an "unnecessary and unwise" conflict, as the late war admittedly was. This readiness of our youth to respond, like Italian mercenaries, is to us alarming, and, if it continue, full of evil promise. For we may rely upon it that, with the increase of our army and navy and of our ambition, this will not be the last war the politicians will get up, in order to save an election, or to help financiers, or to get money through contractors for "the party."

Are we, then, in favor of peace at any price, or opposed to all war? Have we no respect for "the soldier's glorious trade," or for military courage, or for the great exploits by which empires have been built? The greatest possible. We have here a placatory clause against which the gates of hell cannot prevail, namely, Do not go to war until you know what it is about and whether it cannot be avoided. Above all, in a democracy, see that your wars are defensive, and not wars of conquest or contractors' wars. The morality and necessity of all offensive wars are doubtful, for their secret causes lie beyond the reach of the ordinary citizen's inquiry. The politician's temptation to deceive or humbug him is almost irresistible. But there never can be any doubt about the morality and necessity of a defensive war. For that too great a number of young men cannot rush to the field. Washington's war was defensive. The soldiers of Bunker Hill and Yorktown and Saratoga were defending their liberty. They had that most precious thing, "a cause" which they understood and could justify. When they suffered, they suffered from poverty, not from villany. When they died, they were sure they died for man, and not that a political party might keep "the offices" and demagogues blather over the dead.

THE QUESTION OF RESPONSIBILITY.

Some days ago the organ of the Administration in New York, in a passage on which we made a few remarks last week, spoke as follows:

> "The final character of our colonial rule depends on the people, not on the President. No Administration makes the spoils system, but the popular pressure against which Presidents with varying force contend, and the public opinion which encourages or discourages them in resisting spoilsmen."

It has been impossible or very difficult (for those, at least, who neither admire nor trust Mr. McKinley) not to take this sort of semi-official announcement as connected with a President's failure,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the first time in twenty-five years, to make any mention in his message of civil-service reform. This almost formal warning that the present Executive will not be responsible for the way in which our new possessions are to be governed, is enough to send a cold shiver down the back of an honest expansionist. We know, too, that he is at this moment contemplating the removal of about 2,000 places from the classification, and handing them back to the spoilsmen on a report from them that they would like to have the disposal of them. In fact, the signs and omens are to-day all unpleasant as regards the Executive, good as they may be as regards the public at large.

Various commercial bodies all over the country are already moving in the direction of consular reform, and their memorials to the President all assume that he can bring about the change and make our shame to cease if he pleases; and this at the very moment that his own organs are giving out that the matter does not depend on him, but on the "people." In a speech which Mr. McKinley made at Savannah recently, he said:

> "If, following the clear precepts of duty, territory falls to us, and the welfare of an alien people requires our guidance and protection, who will shrink from the responsibility, grave though it be?"

Here he clearly recognizes the existence of responsibility somewhere—how created, he does not explain—for "the welfare of an alien people," and inquires, "Who will shrink from the responsibility, grave though it be?" Now the responsibility for the welfare of an alien people always devolves, in civilized governments on the chief of the state, that is, on the Executive. There are both reason and business in this arrangement. Seventy millions of men, women, and children engaged in earning their bread or completing their education cannot "afford guidance and protection to an alien people."

They have enough to do to secure "guidance and protection" for themselves. They pay $50,000 a year and provide with a house a gentleman named McKinley, for taking care of such "alien peoples" as he brings home, all out of their scanty earnings. They do not expect him to shout to them to look after the Tagals and the Malays, after he has himself invited them to look on him as their "great father." The great Griggs has, it is true, perorated much about the eagerness of the American people for "responsibility" for inferior races, but the only sign of this responsibility we have seen is to be found in the Griggs "rainbow" speeches. What the American people *plainly* wishes, is that Admiral Dewey should supply the guidance and protection, and they will gladly read accounts of his chastisement of inferior races with quick-firing guns. But that "the people" means itself to take any special measure about any "alien people" we have never heard, and do not believe.

Another thing to be remembered is that this tendency on the part of American officials to throw responsibility on "the people" and shirk it themselves, is almost as old as the republic, and the principal thing against which the friends of good government have had to contend ever since "reform" first began to be spoken of. If an official does not take refuge behind "the people," he takes refuge behind "the party." He always tries to make "the party" responsible for the administration of his office. If he or his subordinates do wrong, it is "the party" which is to blame. In large affairs it is "the people"; and, of course, "the party" and "the people" are both bodies which, for purposes of administration, can neither be found nor called to account. It was an old maxim of the Schoolmen that the same rule applies both "to things which are not visible and things which are non-existent." This is singularly true in politics. In the mouth of a guilty or negligent official "the people" is simply the "wicked partner." All that has been accomplished in the way of civil-service reform has been the work of Presidents who boldly met their responsibility to the nation. All the failures which civil-service reformers have met with have been due to the dishonest or corrupt pretence of Presidents that they could not resist "the pressure"—that is, the persuasion of a small group of men in Washington whom they knew to be both venal and selfish.

If, now, the proper government of our dependencies is to be prevented by a pretence of "pressure," if nobody is going to take it in hand until 70,000,000 of people busy themselves about the "guidance and protection" of our new acquisitions, we confidently predict that the 12,000,000 we have seized will "get left." War is a delightfully exciting pastime, for the women and boys especially, who read about "thrilling exploits" in the newspapers. It seems so easy to govern "dependencies" by reading of their seizure by the army and navy in the penny *Blatherskite;* but governing them in a manner on which we can invoke "the considerate judgment of mankind and the gracious favor of Almighty God," is a very different matter. Very few want to read about the details of administration, and least of all the women who love war and think it improves a young man's character. Administering subject-races when you receive little or no help from the ruled, is one of the dryest and dreariest of human occupations. To do it honestly and efficiently requires the highest character, indomitable industry, and an unconquerable love of detail. The notion that "the people" will engage in it, or watch it, or concern themselves about it abroad, any more than they have concerned themselves about it at home, has a dishonest stamp on its face when produced by an expansionist. Those on whom the responsibility of governing our new dominions falls are the Executive first, and then Congress, and they ought to be at work at it now, instead of delivering homilies on the magnificence of the task and urging their neighbors to tackle it.

JUSTIN S. MORRILL.

The biography of Justin S. Morrill will, if it come to be written, embrace a large part of the political and especially of the financial history of the United States during the last forty-five years. He was elected a Representative in Congress in 1854 and has held a seat in one house or the other ever since. No other member now living has sat there so long without intermission. When he entered public life, Franklin Pierce was President and Jefferson Davis Secretary of War. Stephen A. Douglas was the leader of the Democratic party in the North, and Abraham Lincoln, though he had sat in Congress, was little known beyond the borders of his own State. James Buchanan came to the Presidency two years later, and the drama of secession and civil war did not open until Mr. Morrill's third term in the House. Only persons well past middle life can remember the time when he was not in Congress. It was his fortune to represent a State not afflicted with the Boss system. Consequently, there was never any question respecting his seat so long as he cared to occupy it. The office sought him in the beginning and continued to seek him to the end. He never had to fight for his seat, or to concern himself about retaining it; and in this respect, as well as in the length of his occupancy of it, his career has been unique.

A man thus favored by opportunity ought to have made a mark upon the times in which he lived, and this Mr. Morrill has done in two or three ways. His name is coupled with the tariff legislation of the civil war. This may or may not have been wise. History will deal with that question as it has dealt with the corn laws of England and other restrictive legislation of the past. The principle of protectionism was dead when Mr. Morrill entered Congress, and he never thought of reviving it until the war made increased revenues, both by tariff and internal taxes, necessary. Mr. Morrill, while a believer in protection, was not an extremist. The bills later than his own (of which there were two or three while he was still a member of the House) were not at all to his liking, but he went with his party. He could hardly do otherwise, yet his influence was generally given for lower duties than his party associates desired. So well was this known that the protected

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

classes made it a practice of doubling their demands, because they knew that Father Morrill would cut them down one-half.

Mr. Morrill's best influence upon the financial legislation of the country was negative rather than positive. He was a stubborn opponent of Government paper money in all forms, down to the day of his death, and he never omitted an opportunity to express his opinions. When the legal-tender act was introduced in the session of 1861-'62 he spoke against it, voted against it, and wrote against it. His early arguments on this subject as read to-day do not suffer by comparison with anything that has been said or written since. He held that honest taxation and honest borrowing were the only safe and just methods for obtaining the means to carry on the war, and that legal-tender issues were both dangerous and dishonest. It was largely due to his efforts and his rising influence on the financial side of legislation that a limit was finally put to greenback issues. In the latter part of 1863 that limit was reached and was adhered to. Congress had come to Mr. Morrill's platform, and from that time forward the war was carried on by taxation and borrowing only. Government notes were still issued to some extent, but they bore interest and hence were in the nature of loans, and were as little mischievous as possible. Mr. Morrill, as he had opposed the greenbacks in their inception, was always in favor of their retirement, and in the later struggles over the silver question was always the leading opponent of every form of depreciated currency. The Government credit was ever the object of his solicitude and the very apple of his eye.

Mr. Morrill left his mark in another department of public affairs. He was the author of the Agricultural College act, by virtue of which a large part of the public domain was saved from the grasp of railroad speculators and applied to the purposes of education. This is perhaps the act by which Mr. Morrill will be longest known to posterity. He was distinguished also by his opposition to all kinds of foreign adventure. He opposed the annexation of San Domingo, of St. Thomas, of Hawaii, and of the Spanish colonies in the East and West Indies. His death at this time is a serious loss to those who are opposing the ratification of the treaty with Spain.

Mr. Morrill was not an orator. His speeches were all written and read from manuscript, yet they will outlive most of the random talk of the Senate of the present day. He was a man of spotless character. He was never a place-seeker for himself or for anybody else. Among all the bad appointments that have disgraced the civil service from time to time, nobody can recall one that is associated with his name. No scandal ever came near him. He was modest to a fault. He had no aim or desire beyond the performance of his duty. He never wore his patriotism on his sleeve. He was of the best type of American statesmanship—one of the old school that we read about in the history of the American Revolution and of the years immediately succeeding—the school of Roger Sherman and Albert Gallatin; and as he is carried to the grave we ask ourselves doubtfully, not whether his successors will be born, but whether they will find their way into public life.

THE SPANISH STORY OF SANTIAGO.

Almost the first full account of the siege and battles of Santiago from the Spanish point of view is to be found in a book published in Madrid by a lieutenant in the Spanish navy, Don José Müller y Tejeiro. Stationed at Santiago before the arrival of Cervera's squadron, he was personally cognizant of most of the subsequent operations; and from his own diary, and from accounts given him by participants in the land battles and in the sea fight, he is able to give a connected and consecutive story of each day's events. He includes in his book, which he entitles 'Combates y Capitulación de Santiago de Cuba,' a few official documents—such as reports of the number of troops, the returns of killed and wounded, the paper drawn up by the Spanish officers advising Toral to surrender, etc. None of these throws much new light on the campaign, their chief value, as also that of Lieut. Tejeiro's records from day to day, being to show under what hopeless disadvantages and mismanagement the Spanish cause labored from the first.

The Lieutenant makes no complaints. He writes with true Spanish fatalism. Yet his narrative avails to set forth the neglect and *insouciance* of the Spanish authorities in strong colors. When Cervera entered Santiago, he knew, in spite of the rejoicings in Spain, that his fleet was doomed. So did all the military authorities at Santiago—at least, as soon as they learned that no more ships were coming to support Cervera. While Madrid was joyful, consternation reigned in Santiago. The naval and army authorities foresaw at once what would happen—the blockade, the American military expedition, the siege and its predestined end. Yet what was done? Absolutely nothing, except to prepare to die like Spaniards. The town was but scantily provisioned to begin with. There was a margin of nine or ten days before the blockade began, in which to import supplies from Jamaica, but not a ship's load entered. After it was too late, the attempt was made to run in cargoes of provisions, but, of course, the American blockaders captured them all. Then there was the question of reinforcements. Fifteen or twenty thousand troops were within call at Holguin, Manzanillo, and elsewhere; but not a battalion moved. Finally, when again too late, Gen. Escario marched his 3,000 men from Manzanillo, only to arrive after the fighting was over and to hasten the surrender of the garrison by the sooner exhausting their meagre supplies.

As for Cervera's squadron, Lieut. Tejeiro adds new details to the facts showing the crippled condition in which it went out to be destroyed. Short of coal, short of guns, short of ammunition, with boilers and engines out of order, the ships were lost before they sailed. No one knew this more certainly than Cervera and his men. They went out only on positive orders, and they went out to infallible destruction. The serene courage with which they did it is enough to justify Lieut. Tejeiro in asserting that July 3, in spite of its disastrous results, was a glorious day for Spain. No country ever saw her sons go to certain death with a calmer bravery. It is a fine picture which the Lieutenant gives us of a gallant gentleman when he describes Cervera on his flagship at the moment of clearing the channel. Already the *María Teresa* was under a hail of shot, already the dead and wounded were thick on her decks and in her batteries. But the Admiral coolly stepped to the ship's side to see the pilot off, and called out, smiling, "Good-bye, pilot. Hurry out of this! They mustn't fail to pay you, for you have earned your money."

The fighting on land was clearly as much of a revelation of the American soldier to the Spanish as it was of the Spanish to the American. Lieut. Tejeiro speaks in warm praise, and with a certain surprise, of the intrepid dash of the American troops charging entrenchments held by men with modern repeating rifles. But the Spanish regulars lived up to that proudest Spanish boast, that they "knew how to die." Out of 520 men in the trenches at El Caney, but 80 came out alive. It was the Twenty-ninth Battalion of the Constitution that bore the brunt of this deadly assault, and Lieut. Tejeiro says, what we have heard from other sources, that, after the surrender, whenever the American soldiers saw a Spaniard with "29" on his collar, they instantly fell to shaking his hand and offering to treat him. A like agreeable discovery of each other's quality was made in the care of the Spanish wounded who fell into our hands. When told by a Lieutenant of the attentions lavished upon him in the American hospital, Señor Tejeiro innocently wrote: "So it was only the American Government and the Jingoes who were bloodthirsty."

He closes with a few frank remarks about the causes which led to the Spanish loss of Cuba. Chief among these he places the selfish exploitation of the island, solely in the interest of Spain and of Spanish officials. Then he also admits, while he deplores, the excessive

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cruelty which had marked Spanish administration, and especially Spanish attempts to put down insurrection. Outrage provoking outrage, and massacre leading to massacre, the condition of things in Cuba at the beginning of this year was, he confesses, such as to excuse, if not justify, interference by other countries.

THE ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION AT NEW HAVEN.

NEW HAVEN, December 30, 1898.

The eleventh annual meeting of the American Economic Association, held here this week with Yale University, was one of the most satisfactory in the recent history of the Association. Attendance was large and representative. The academic element predominated, and certain familiar figures from the Western and Middle States were absent; but this seems to be remediable neither by variety in programme nor alternation in place of assembly. The simultaneous meeting of the American Historical Association offered pleasant opportunities for joint sessions and personal intercourse, and many will regret the apparent necessity for separate gatherings of the two organizations in 1899.

The characteristic features of the meeting were the successful use of special committees for the investigation of assigned economic topics, and the relative dominance in programme and in discussion of practical economic questions over aspects of economic theory. The first fact represents a further stage in the evolution of the traditional scheme of detailed, miscellaneous papers into a series of general discussions of larger economic problems. The use of special committee reports as a basis for discussion removes the one danger of this plan by assuring active debate and substantial results, and is likely to become the future policy of the Association. The emphasis put upon problems of economic practice as contrasted with economic theory reflects the current phase of economic study. A few years since, the reaction against the historical movement in economic science, accentuated by the acute deductive studies of the Austrian economists, led to remarkable activity in economic analysis. The results can hardly be said to have been commensurate with the effort expended, and the return of the younger American economists to the domain of concrete economic investigation, leaving the field of constructive economic theory, temporarily at least, in the possession of the few mature economists possessing especial fitness therefor, can only be accounted a distinct scientific gain.

Singularly enough, this was foreshadowed in President Arthur T. Hadley's brilliant address on Tuesday evening on "The Relation between Economics and Politics." With characteristic originality of thought and vigor of expression, Prof. Hadley analyzed the palpable phenomenon that, at the present day, with economic science in some respects at the height of its prosperity, the practical influence of the economists on government and legislation is not only less than it should be, but actually less than it many times has been. It is the same circumstance which Prof. F. H. Giddings briefly discussed at the Baltimore meeting two years ago under the title, "Popular Respect for Economic Knowledge." Prof. Hadley found the primary cause of this condition of affairs to be the fact that the new political economy has substituted a vaguer conception of wealth for the more concrete one, and many of its propositions have suffered a corresponding loss of clearness and precision. With this loss of concreteness of conception has come a loss of definiteness of aim—the almost inevitable result of substituting the principles of a science for the practice of an art. Not only have the utterances of the economists thus lost in precision, but the scope of their influence has been further reduced by the modern development of jurisprudence and administration. The courts have made themselves independent of the aid of the economists by basing their adjudication of distinctly modern problems upon precedent rather than upon scientific analysis. Similarly, the organization of modern representative government, with its neglect of collective interests and its checks upon administrative power, has further reduced the economist to the exercise of an uncertain, spasmodic influence.

Such an analysis affords no warrant for pessimism. It simply emphasizes the message—delivered by Prof. Hadley in no uncertain tone—that at this time, of all others, with new problems at hand of the gravest economic import, the economists should recognize that their largest opportunity in the immediate future lies "not in theories but in practice, not with students but with statesmen, not in the education of individual citizens, however widespread and salutary, but in the leadership of an organized body politic."

The session on Wednesday morning was devoted to the report of the special committee appointed at the Cleveland meeting a year ago to consider the scope and method of the twelfth census. Under the chairmanship of Prof. Richmond Mayo-Smith of Columbia University, the committee have performed a valuable service by securing a series of valuable papers from independent authors upon various phases of the last Federal census, together with suggestions regarding the scope and method of the next. These papers will be printed at an early date as a monograph of the Association. In addition, a circular-letter was sent to all members of the Association inviting specific criticisms and suggestions, and the practical conclusions of the committee are based in part upon the opinions thus received. The desirability of a permanent census organization and its subordination to civil-service rules is noted; and a reduction of the number and variety of the investigations ordered, by the transfer of certain subordinate inquiries to established departments, is advised. Attention is also called to positive defects in census methods, such as the lack of comparability in the data from census to census, the lack of coordination, faults of enumeration, and faults in the textual analysis of the figures.

The only two phases of the committee's report discussed by the Association were the attempts to secure statistics of capital in manufacture and statistics of municipal finance. As to the practicability of securing any adequate presentation of the capital engaged in industry, there was marked difference of opinion. As to the painful inadequacy of the statistics of municipal finance contained in the last census, and the importance of sound but simple classification in the coming enumeration, there was practical unanimity.

A no less noteworthy report was presented on Thursday morning by the committee on currency reform, also appointed at Cleveland a year ago, under the chairmanship of Prof. F. M. Taylor of the University of Michigan. Expressly disavowing any responsibility of the Association for the views presented, and making no attempt to further complicate the situation by the formulation of another comprehensive plan of reform, the committee expressed their own opinions as to the need, objects, and methods of such reform in a series of candid, moderate statements.

The need of reform is found in the insecurity of the standard, the inelasticity of the circulation, and the present peculiar conjuncture of circumstances favorable to reform. The committee admit that to a large number of economists the gold standard, abstractly considered, is undesirable; but the particular substitute which such economists favor, *i. e.*, international bimetallism, is described as no longer a practical issue, and until it again becomes so it is highly desirable, as even the sturdiest international bimetallist will admit, that all uncertainty as to the basis of the currency be removed. This can be effected by an explicit definition of the standard in terms of gold, by devolving upon the banks the task of maintaining the convertibility into gold of other forms of currency, or, if this be found impracticable, by a reorganization of the Treasury Department with reference to the duty of maintaining the standard.

The security of the standard once established, some measure of elasticity should be introduced in the circulating note system and some provision made for the extension of banking into country districts. Note issue based in part upon ordinary banking assets, and a supplementary system of branch banking, seem the best methods for accomplishing these results. Failing these, a number of familiar amendments of the national banking act are suggested.

In connection with the report on currency reform is to be mentioned Prof. F. W. Taussig's striking paper on "Some Aspects of the United States Treasury Situation in the Years from 1894 to 1896." The paper dealt with the manner in which the Treasury accumulated and hoarded legal tender notes in these years, and more particularly during the period from November, 1895, to October, 1896. This process of hoarding greenbacks must have been the result of deliberate policy by the Administration; yet, strange to say, not a word is to be found concerning it in the official Treasury reports. Just as the silver currency, issued under the act of 1878, proved to be excessive during a period of depression, and flowed back into the Treasury in 1884-86, so the legal tenders flowed back in 1894-96. The essential difference was that in 1884-86 the Treasury was so fortunate as to have a large excess of receipts over expenditures, and was able quietly to hoard a large volume of silver currency. This condition was lacking in 1894-96, and the resulting difficulties and disturbances may be expected, in the entire absence of any means of accommodating the volume of the currency to the varying condition of business, to recur with any period of depression.

The only contribution to economic theory, but probably the most important single pa-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

per, presented at the meeting, was Prof. John B. Clark's profound study on "Dynamic Standards of Wages and Interest." Both in its interpretation of the classical theory of normal cost and in the analysis of the interrelation of wages and entrepreneur's gain, the essay formed a weighty addition to the modern theory of distribution. It afforded new evidence of the completeness with which Prof. Clark is developing the details of his economic system, and heightened the eagerness with which his long-promised treatise is awaited.

The session of Wednesday afternoon was devoted to papers on American Economic History. In addition to Prof. Taussig's study noted above, Dr. G. S. Callender presented an admirable essay upon the origin of internal improvement enterprises in the United States; Prof. J. C. Schwab gave a further instalment of his laborious researches into the financial history of the Confederate States, in the form of a careful survey of prices and price movements during the civil war; Prof. C. S. Walker reviewed the course of recent economic changes in Massachusetts. The remaining papers were presented on Thursday afternoon by Mr. W. F. Willoughby on the present study of labor problems in France; by Mr. C. W. Curtis on municipal taxation as a means of public control of corporations; by Dr. Max West upon the nature of municipal franchises. In the uniformly high quality of the papers presented, this session was one of the most successful of the meeting.

The arrangement of the programme permitted attendance upon the address of the President of the American Historical Association, Prof. George P. Fisher, on Wednesday evening, and upon the session of that association on Thursday evening, devoted to papers on matters affecting the present foreign policy of the United States. The social features of the meetings were most attractive. Yale University, the New Haven Historical Society, the local committee of arrangements, and resident members of the Association vied in cordiality, while some of the most delightful incidents of the meeting were made possible by the hospitality of the Graduates' Club.

The business transacted by the Council of the Association was for the most part routine. The place and time of the next meeting were fixed, after some discussion—at Ithaca with Cornell University, and the Christmas recess of 1899. The policy of special committees for the investigation of designated economic topics was endorsed, and the executive committee were authorized to make necessary selections and appointments. The affairs of the Association are in a satisfactory condition, and additional members will be welcomed upon the nomination of the Secretary, Prof. Walter F. Willcox, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. Prof. Hadley was reëlected President for the ensuing year.

J. H. H.

THE ABBÉ MORELLET.

PARIS, December 13, 1898.

The Abbé Morellet, so well known in the latter part of the eighteenth century among the promoters of the science of political economy, was a great friend of Lord Shelburne, who became Marquis of Lansdowne. His correspondence with Lord Shelburne is now in London, at Lansdowne House. It has just been published by Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice, author of a Life of Lord Shelburne.* The intimate relations of the Abbé Morellet with English society lend a particular interest to this correspondence.

"The cause of peace," says Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice in a short preface, "and the cause of the abolition of commercial hindrances, especially of those which hamper the trade between France and England, are the causes which Morellet defends always and everywhere. He will say with Talleyrand: 'What is a treaty of peace? It is not a treaty which, regulating the sum of the contested objects, substitutes a state of peace for a state of war; it must besides substitute friendship for hatred.' Morellet thought that he saw such a peace in 1783, when the Treaty of Versailles, negotiated by his friend Lord Shelburne, put an end to war in Europe and recognized the independence of the English colonies in America."

Such a peace, a peace substituting friendship for hatred, is seldom to be obtained, and the close of the present century seems to show us, in Europe, a renewal of international hatred like that which embittered the last days of the philanthropic Morellet. Could he live again, he would also see how little progress those principles of political economy of which he was an ardent defender have made. He had the satisfaction of seeing many barriers to trade destroyed in France, and destroyed for ever; but he would now see international barriers raised all over the world, and protectionism in the ascendant at the end of a century which prides itself on being an era of progress. Some of the letters of Morellet on the question of protection are singularly eloquent. Read, for instance, this written on the 12th of March, 1776, from Paris:

"Our peasants have been delivered of the corvée and do not revolt in order to be subjected to it again. Guilds have been abolished, and we have as good cloth and as good shoes as before, and the workmen have not begun a civil war. We have given liberty to the trade in bread and meat over a territory of four hundred square leagues about the capital; bread and meat abound in Paris more than before. Such is the effect of the plain policy which restores liberty to us; for, as liberty is a natural state, and as all hindrances make on the contrary a forced state, if you give liberty, everything takes its place again and all is at peace."

Morellet, in the same letter, blames the English Government for its behavior towards the Americans:

"You are, unfortunately, still far from the principles I have set forth, though you have already very precious liberties. The liberty of commerce is still wanting. . . . Your Ministers have not seen that by enslaving and ruining the Americans they are drying up an abundant source of wealth and of necessities of which the natural relations between a metropolis and a colony, between people of the same blood and speaking the same language, would assure them the principal part, even if they were left completely free and absolutely independent. The stupid jealousy of trade which, for two centuries, has taken the place of other political follies, makes you to-day increase the burden of the national debt—that is to say, impoverishes you now, and will impoverish you more in the future, by the ruin of a vast country which you ought to regard as land added to your own. Your ministers are like a feudal lord who . . . should make war on his own farmers, and seize their horses and set fire to their barns—which would certainly hinder them from paying their rent the year after. This is the sublime policy against which you and a few sensible people have arrayed yourselves with so much force and reason."

The Abbé Morellet's correspondence with Lord Shelburne begins in January, 1772, and goes as far as 1803. We find in it details on Helvetius, Baron d'Holbach, Dr. Priestley, Dr. Price. Morellet takes much interest in English affairs. He gives his friend all the news of Paris, of Madame Geoffrin, of whom Shelburne said that she was the only person "whom he would like to be governed by"; of Mademoiselle de Lespinasse: "She continues to say that you are of all Englishmen the one who pleased her most—I would not say the most amiable, since you have a little aversion to that word."

In 1775 Turgot was appointed Controller-General. France was threatened with famine, and bread became so dear that the people rose in various places against the bakers and the farmers. At Versailles a troop of peasants pillaged the market; in Paris four or five hundred people forced an entrance into all the bakers' shops, and the police did not interfere. Turgot obtained at once from the King the dismissal of the Lieutenant of Police, named Le Noir; he took energetic measures, notwithstanding the resistance of the Parlement, and the King supported him against it. "The King showed himself very reasonable and firm." At that very moment Necker wrote a pamphlet on "Legislation and the Corn Trade," which Morellet sent to Lord Shelburne. In it Necker attacked violently Turgot's administration. Morellet stood by Turgot. "Some," he says, "find the pamphlet excellent; others, among whom am I, find it very bad." Turgot suppressed as fast as he could all privileges.

"He has just suppressed the privileges of the cities of Bordeaux and of Marseilles, which were a great inconvenience to the wine trade. It is to be hoped that this operation will bring agriculture in all the provinces of Languedoc to a high state of prosperity. You will have cheaper wine and our gains will be greater. Turgot continues to destroy all the hindrances to liberty of trade—our guilds, with their privileges always fatal to industry, to the activity and the wealth of the nation; he attacks and suppresses all the rights of way, etc., all the tolls on roads and rivers; . . . he reforms all our municipal administrations, whose expenses were excessive, often without object or utility. . . . In short, we are going in the right direction, and if we have only three or six years of this administration, there will be so much good done that we shall be obliged to continue, and I do not doubt that this will be a memorable time in the history of our monarchy."

When the American crisis became acute, Morellet wrote to Lord Shelburne (January 5, 1777):

"We take much interest in American affairs, and there are more partisans of liberty for Americans in Paris than in the whole province of New York. We have read with much pleasure the letter of Franklin to Lord Howe, and we wait with some impatience for the good news of a defeat of Gen. Cornwallis. You will say, perhaps, that we are less the friends of liberty for Americans than the enemies of Great Britain, and this may be true of many people among us; but I am glad to tell you that everybody is not so anti-British, and that I wish you great prosperity while I want the Americans to be free, and that many of us are of that mind."

Turgot was dismissed in the beginning of 1777. Morellet regrets it, though he confesses to Lord Shelburne that Turgot was very maladroit in persuading men. He announces in the same letter the marriage of his niece to Marmontel and the illness of Madame Geoffrin; a little later the death of this famous "mother of the philosophers."

The American war is the subject of many letters. Morellet never had a doubt as to the final triumph of the American cause; he told Lord Shelburne over and over again

*'Lettres de l'Abbé Morellet à Lord Shelburne.' Paris: Plon, Nourrit & Cie.; New York: Dyrsen & Pfeiffer. 1898.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that England could not bear for many years the expense of a war on the continent of America and on the high seas in all parts of the world. He quotes often the French proverb, "Les plus courtes folies sont les meilleures." When war was declared between France and England, the relations of Morellet and Lord Shelburne were not interrupted, though they became more distant and difficult.

"Turgot's rival, Necker, supports himself in a difficult situation. He seems to conduct our finances to the general satisfaction. He has introduced some order and economy into them. He resists with courage the avidity of the courtiers. He maintains the public credit. His principles regarding the administration of commerce are not those of the men who have most reflected on the subject, and I count myself in that number. But he does not much interfere with that object, and leaves things as they are" (July 13, 1780).

We see by this letter that, though Morellet was personally much attached to Turgot, he could be just to Necker. He considered the latter, however, an ordinary man, and he writes that "people must be mediocre to be called to the administration of the state by the sovereign. It is with you as with us. I think that kings have discovered that men of genius can only spoil everything, and that mediocrity of mind and of talent is for them *aurea mediocritas*. It certainly is for those who are endowed with it, and it conducts them surely to wealth and honors."

In 1782 Lord North fell from power, and a new cabinet was formed by Lord Rockingham. Lord Shelburne became Under-Secretary for the Colonies in this cabinet, while M. Dunning and Colonel Barré, both friends of Morellet, became the one Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, the other Treasurer of the Navy. "Yes, my lord," writes Morellet, "though we are divided by war, I am glad to see your country better governed. You know my cosmopolitan disposition."

Morellet has many interesting observations to make on the movements of opinion which preceded the French Revolution. We find in his letters important remarks on the Assembly of Notables, convoked in 1787, on the administration of M. de Calonne and of Necker, on the financial situation of France, on the convocation of the States-General. We see him becoming more and more uneasy as the Revolution goes on. Some of the changes wrought by the Constituent Assembly meet with his approval. "I consider," he says, "as established for ever consent to taxation, ministerial responsibility, liberty of the press, the abolition of all privileges, and even the distinction of the three orders; I believe, also, that the old divisions of provinces which, by remaining separate, might have created obstacles to the new constitution, will cease to exist; and, finally, I regard all these changes as the happiest event which could befall a nation." His criticisms are formulated thus: "I consider as defects in our new constitution [of 1791] (1) not to have established two chambers; (2) not to have left to the King an absolute and independent veto, limited only by the obligation of consent to taxation and of ministerial responsibility; (3) not to have given sufficient power to the executive, which is placed in a position of weakness that cannot be remedied." Morellet's fears were not vain; and the event soon proved that the executive power was totally disarmed.

Morellet's relations with England were long interrupted by the Revolution and by the war; they were resumed only after the peace of Amiens. Morellet early prophesied that the republican form of government would be followed by a military despotism. His letters of December 3, 1802, and of January, 1803, are the last of the volume. He says in one: "You can form only a very imperfect idea of all we have had to suffer." We can imagine it when we contrast the liberal and generous thoughts of Morellet with the doctrines to which France became a prey in the years of the Terror and of the Directory.

Correspondence.

MR. CALKINS'S PROGRAMME.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I wish to suggest that Mr. Calkins, in the *Nation* of December 5, makes some very heavy demands on us. I suppose we must, as he says, "pay the twenty millions to Spain, and then give it all away." And not only that, but if we keep the islands wrested from Spain even for a short time, we buy with the twenty millions the privilege of wasting countless millions more on battle-ships and standing armies; we buy with the twenty millions the privilege of playing the fool. But why must we "secure order, religious freedom, and equality before the law" in those islands? We have neither order nor religious freedom nor equality before the law at home. Hadn't we better first try to secure those priceless blessings for ourselves and our posterity? Is not that the duty that lies nearest to be done? It is a trite saying that the age of miracles is past. For one, I do not see how I can give to islanders half round the globe what I am not able to secure for myself at home.

But admit, for a moment, that we are a civilized nation, and not 70,000,000 savages, or, what amounts to nearly the same thing, men of "dull, commonplace, untrained, incoherent" minds. Admit that we could accomplish what our experience has shown to be clearly impossible; is it our duty to attempt it? What duty do we owe those islanders, other than what we owe the rest of mankind, Spaniards among the rest; that is, freedom? And is not that debt fully discharged when we simply let them alone?

I do not see, then, how I am "bound in conscience and before the world to take care of the helpless people whose cause we rashly took in hand." I cannot take care of myself and my family. Every day my own liberty and those of my neighbors are trampled under foot by war, humbug, and imperialism. But I am surely as much bound in conscience as Mr. Calkins or Dr. McKinley—unless, indeed, they have done the people in question a wrong in overthrowing the Spanish authority; and this Dr. McKinley at least indignantly denies.

It is no man's duty to govern any other man. The affirmative of the proposition is a rank absurdity. It is no man's duty to take care of another man while the latter is learning to govern himself. Our first duty to all islanders and all men is to let them alone. Our second duty is to *let them alone*. Our third duty is to LET THEM ALONE. Here we have the great fundamental higher law of liberty, which, to my mind, comprises the whole duty of man in his relations to his fellow-man.

"Our true country," says Lowell (he puts it in the mouth of the Rev. Homer Wilbur, who never, I doubt not, preached from the text, "I came not to send peace on earth, but a sword")—"Our true country is bounded on the north and the south, on the east and the west, by justice, and when she oversteps that invisible boundary line, even by so much as a hair's-breadth, she ceases to be our mother." The McKinley Administration has overstepped that invisible boundary-line by the width of the seas that wash Cuba, by half the circumference of the globe; and we have lost our country. It is an overwhelming calamity not only to ourselves, but to all mankind.

A. F. HAMILTON.

GRANVILLE, O., December 24, 1898.

THE SUPPOSED LINCOLN PARALLEL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. Lincoln became President under pledges not to interfere with slavery; yet within two years he issued the edict of emancipation. This is urged by our imperialists and expansionists as a reason why we may seize Cuba, notwithstanding the solemn pledge made by Congress to Cuba and to the world just before the declaration of war against Spain. Mr. McKelway (who, unfortunately for his past reputation, seems trying to pose as the ideal Jingo), for one, has publicly urged this argument, and it is of such a popular and taking kind that its fallacy needs pointing out before, by constant repetition, it becomes stereotyped.

The proposition as to Mr. Lincoln is true. He represented the general sentiment of the Republican party. The writer was able to say to one of the most prominent citizens in Lynchburg, Va., after the beginning of the war: "I am a Republican, and live in a Republican town, in a Republican State; my profession makes me acquainted with the ideas of the people; I know what they say at their firesides; and there is not the slightest wish to interfere with slavery in the Southern States, where we believe it is guaranteed by the Constitution. We think it an evil, and are opposed to its farther extension. The Abolitionist candidate for Governor, Gerrit Smith, only polled a little over 5,000 votes in the great Empire State of New York."

The fallacy lies in the application. Mr. Lincoln's pledges were made on the supposition of continued peace. War breaks all bonds and changes all conditions. The solemn pledge made by Congress about Cuba, on the other hand, was made with the full expectation of war, and even a confidence in a successful war. The circumstances have not changed. They are precisely what Congress contemplated when it gave the pledge. Is there any parallel here for a moralist?

W. ALLEN JOHNSON.

MIDDLETOWN, CONN., December 30, 1898.

SENATOR HANNA'S NAVAL IDEAS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It seems to me that the real objection on the part of Senator Hanna of Ohio to the increase of the navy recommended by Secretary Long is not on account of economy, nor on account of the progress made from time to time in ship construction, but because the money asked for the increase of the navy is desired for the shipping subsidies called for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the measure recently introduced in the Senate by Mr. Hanna himself. An argument against building ships for the navy because ships improve in type and efficiency from time to time, is similar to the objection urged by the small boy to washing his face—because it would get dirty again.

The close of the war with Spain leaves the navy in an absolute sense no stronger than it was before the destruction of the *Maine*, while in a relative sense, with the duties of the protection and defence of our new insular acquisitions, and (above all) with our appearance in the rôle of an Asiatic Power, we are very much weaker as a naval Power than before.

Destructive criticism is of course easy and cheap, while criticism of a constructive nature is difficult to be had; still, it may not be too late for Senator Hanna and others to realize that the only statesmanlike way of avoiding the necessity of a very natural increase of the navy and naval expenditure is to resign the Philippines to their inhabitants, or to exchange them for British islands near our own coasts. By the latter method our naval power and responsibilities will be more self-centred and hence less extravagant in their necessities. H.

THE PROFESSOR AND HIS ASSISTANT.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The "American Professor" contributing the leading article to the December *Educational Review* claims for his colleagues more liberal salaries, larger authority, and more leisure. He has my hearty support, and I wish his arguments might be brought to the notice of all trustees and others concerned. But another desideratum in university administration has been suggested to me (not for the first time) by his article which has in view the advancement and increased influence of the American university. I refer to the *proper use*, on the part of the American professor, *of such authority as he enjoys*. So far as I am aware, the professor in the higher institutions has, as a rule, pretty free control over his own department; but my observation has been that such control is not always exercised for the best interests of the department and of the institution, and, hence, of the higher learning. To make a long story short, human weakness of one sort or other frequently causes the professor to fail either in having the right men appointed as assistants or in sufficiently encouraging the younger instructors to do their share of the higher university work. In the course of years, not one, but many such cases have come to my notice. The failure to get out of the younger elements of the faculty the best that is in them has a retarding influence on university development, quite as much, possibly, as the older professors' poor pay and lack of leisure; it is one of the causes of the continued preponderance of preparatory work even in some of our greatest universities—not in all, and not in all departments alike; the most extreme cases occurring probably in the modern languages, where elementary work is the rule and philological, post-graduate study the exception. Here, then, is an opportunity for many a professor, faculty, and president to use such authority as they have for the advancement of higher education. Greater influence in university management, more money, and more leisure, it is to be hoped, will also be theirs in due time. In regard to salary, however, the status of the instructor or assistant is also deserving of consideration; but this concerns the trustee. As one of the older, I feel free to plead for the younger. X.

Notes.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co. will publish immediately, in one volume at a low price, all the requirements in English for "careful study" for the years 1900-1902, as prescribed by the Joint Conference of Colleges and Secondary Schools on Requirements in English for Admission to Colleges. The contents are from Macaulay, Milton, Shakspere, and Burke.

Dodd, Mead & Co. have just imported 'The Dreyfus Case,' by F. C. Conybeare. Mr. Conybeare is probably better informed about all the intricacies of the *cause célèbre* than any other Englishman, and his analysis of the documents and of the various stages of trial and retrial is marked by an acuteness and vigor which his unconcealed belief that Dreyfus is innocent does not at all impair. His work is an excellent preparation for an understanding of the further legal proceedings.

'Angels' Wings' is the title selected by Edward Carpenter for a series of essays upon art and life, to be published soon by the Macmillan Co. The same firm will begin publication next month of *Bird-Lore*, a bi-monthly popular magazine of ornithology, edited by Frank M. Chapman. It will be the organ of the Audubon societies for the protection of birds.

A promising offshoot of the admirable 'Encyclopædia of Sport' recently reviewed by us upon its completion is 'The Sportsman's Year-book,' edited by two of the contributors to the 'Encyclopædia,' Messrs. C. S. Colman and A. H. Windsor (London: Lawrence & Bullen). Its aim, as suggested by Mr. Aflalo, is "a Sportsman's Whitaker," and so it embodies the rules of the chief English sports and games, and takes due notice of "events." Inactive games, like cards or chess, find no place here. The arrangement is alphabetical, from Angling to Yachting. Appendices treat of books of the year to November, 1898; and deaths. Typographically the volume is all that could be desired, and it will fit upon the same shelf with Whitaker.

The eighth issue of *Minerva* (Strassburg: Trübner; New York: Lemcke & Buechner) conveys the gratifying editorial assurance that the enterprise is now on a firm foundation. Among the learned institutions either newly admitted or more thoroughly exhibited in their faculties and personnel, those of Canada are remarked. Non-German institutions now first begin to have their various chairs described in the appropriate vernacular, to avoid error in translating; but this change is too extensive to take place all at once. In view of the scientific congresses convoked for 1900, *Minerva* will next year publish as full a list as possible, with particulars as to place and date of meeting and programme. A portrait of the great Russian international jurist Martens serves as frontispiece to this welcome issue of an invaluable clue to the labyrinth of the "learned world."

From Lemcke & Buechner we receive also the second volume of that other important and in a certain sense kindred undertaking, the German Poole—'Bibliographie der Deutschen Zeitschriften-Litteratur,' embracing not only the German periodical literature of 1897, but additions to the 1896 record (Leipzig: Andrä's Nachfolger). The 399 publications here indexed are most conveniently displayed in numerical order on a single folding sheet. This is, we may remind our readers, a subject-index.

Through the Musée Social is published a work on 'Les Industries Monopolisées aux États-Unis,' by Paul de Rousiers. After giving a history of the more important Trusts, interspersed with observations based upon a visit to this country, M. Rousiers concludes that concentration of industry is a perfectly normal movement; but monopoly is based upon some exceptional condition, which always owes something to artifice. The Standard Oil Trust rests upon an element "essentially artificial," the methods of railroad management, a "disorder purely American." In coal the small operator was crowded out by the larger, and the railroads aided. Sugar rests upon the tariff, and iron and steel did derive support from the customs duties, but have outgrown them, and now stand on an abundance of cheap material and highly specialized methods of manufacture. The author expresses surprise at the duties on pig iron and steel rails in the Dingley bill. In the case of the Whiskey Trust, he attributes too much influence to the tariff and the prohibition movement, and not enough to the internal-revenue legislation. In municipal concerns he believes less danger threatens from private Trusts than from such state Trusts as exist in France. Without being a profound book, this essay is pleasant and suggestive reading, and contains not a few remarkable statements. The "big four" become persons, and the early Presidents are made to come from Virginia, Georgia, and Maryland. The earlier work of Von Halle has been liberally drawn upon.

Pope Leo XIII., notwithstanding his nearly ninety years, is still a devotee of the Muses. In honor of the anniversary of the conversion of King Clovis, he has composed a Latin hymn entitled "The Baptism of Clovis." It begins with the line "Vivat Christus, qui diligit Francos," a sentiment that has aroused enthusiasm throughout France, "the most faithful daughter of the Church." Cardinal Langénieux, the Archbishop of Rheims, intrusted the poem to the Paris composer Théodore Dubois, with instructions to convert it into an oratorio. This was done, but not in time for the great celebration in Rheims in December. It will, however, be rendered later by an orchestra of 150 pieces and a chorus of 200 voices, male and female. According to the report of the *Frankfurter-Zeitung*, the oratorio consists of three parts, one treating of the baptism of Clovis, a second of the heroism of Christianity, a third of the triumph of Christ.

The Social Democrats of Germany make ample use of the periodical press and of book concerns in the interest of their propaganda. The chief organ is the *Vorwärts* of Berlin, which has a subscription list of 52,000, and paid a profit during the past twelve months of 53,000 marks into the treasury of the party. In all, the party publishes 68 papers in Germany, of which 37 appear six days in the week and 16 are bi-weeklies and the rest weeklies.

The protagonists of Social Democratic ideas and ideals have united in a literary

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

venture of an international character, namely, the production of a history of Social Democracy, the propaganda in each country to be treated by separate authors and in separate volumes. The German number of this contemplated series has appeared in the 'Geschichte der Deutschen Sozialdemocratie,' by Franz Mehring, the veteran editor of the Berlin *Volkszeitung*. The work is in two good-sized volumes of 1,136 pages, large octavo, altogether, and is published by Dietz in Stuttgart. Significantly, the price per volume is only 3.60 marks, as the history is evidently intended for wide circulation, and is practically an *apologia pro domo*. The ordinary rules of objective historiography sit lightly on the shoulders of Mehring; and to outsiders his presentation of the immediate past is chiefly interesting and important as an exhibition of how modern political and social developments look through Social Democratic spectacles. The author is himself a representative rather of the older school of Social Democrats, of which probably the best exponent in Germany is Liebknecht, who are characterized more by their bitter antagonism to the existing order of things than by a wise and carefully digested method of effecting a change, which is seemingly the ambition of the newer school. The work is particularly severe in its denunciation of the Hohenzollerns and of Bismarck.

In France the central Government has in recent years taxed bicycles to the extent of ten francs annually for each wheel, receiving from this source a revenue of four millions. Recently the tax has been reduced to six francs. The number of wheels in France is now computed at more than half a million.

By a special ukase of the Czar, the most northeasterly point in Asia, hitherto known as "East Cape," is to bear the Russian name of Cape Deshneff. The object is thus to vindicate for Russia a priority in the discovery of Bering Strait, which was first discovered by the Russian Deshnëff in 1648, while the Dane Bering did not arrive in these waters until 1728. The claims of Deshneff in this regard have recently been thoroughly investigated by the Russian Arctic explorer and specialist Ferdinand von Wrangel, on the basis of whose report this new geographical term has been officially introduced by the Russian Government.

The glaciers of North America are described by Prof. I. C. Russell in the opening article of the *Geographical Journal* for December, in which he calls attention to the fact that America is the only continent which "furnishes characteristic examples of all the types of glaciers now known." This is followed by a brief account of two oceanographical expeditions, in which it is said that the material procured by the closing nets shows that "the intermediate waters of the ocean, from about 100 fathoms beneath the surface down to about 100 fathoms above the bottom," are inhabited, contrary to Mr. Alexander Agassiz's observations. Prof. P. Geddes treats of the influence of geographical conditions on social development, and Dr. Sambon, in a suggestive paper on the acclimatization of Europeans in tropical lands, contends that the great obstacle to tropical colonization is not to be found in the climate—that is, heat and moisture—"but it is with living organisms, from man, wild beasts, and snakes to protozoa and bacteria, that we have to struggle for existence." The achievements in tropical pathology by Pasteur, Koch, and others lead him to believe "that the diseases of the tropics are greatly under our own control."

The *Scottish Geographical Magazine* for December contains an account, by Mrs. Theodore Bent, of a visit to the island of Sokotra, on the east coast of Africa. She dwells particularly on its strange vegetation, especially the dragon's-blood, cucumber, and frankincense trees. In one place the explorers came to a valley entirely full of the latter tree, "with rich red leaves like autumn tints, and clusters of blood-red flowers. No one touches the tree here, and this natural product of the island is completely ignored. There are myrrhs, also ignored, and other gum-producing plants." Some Ethiopic, but no Greek inscriptions were found. The other contents are: the oceanographical results of the Austro-Hungarian deep-sea expeditions, an abstract of a lecture by Prof. Suess on the asymmetry of the northern hemisphere, and a description of the difficulties attending a journey, by sea, from Shanghai to Tientsin and back.

Among the various subjects treated in the Consular Reports for December is "Nuts as food in foreign countries," from which it appears that in 1896 the production of filberts about Trebizond was 38,518,771 pounds, the greater part of which is exported to Marseilles, Trieste, and Italy. There is also an interesting account of Tientsin, which was formerly a military station only, but "to-day it is the home of a million people, with an annual import and export trade aggregating $42,250,000." It has macadamized streets, on which there are "three and even four-story brick buildings, gas works"; and now pipes (from New York) for a very elaborate and perfect water system are being laid. It is the terminus of the Imperial Chinese Railway, of which 320 miles of road have been constructed (80 miles in double track), and 125 are now under construction. During the eleven months ending in June there were carried 1,216,885 passengers and 1,870,118 tons of freight. "The traffic is rapidly increasing, and already the road is paying handsome dividends."

In a late number of the *Monthly Weather Review*, the probable state of the sky along the path of the total eclipse of May 28, 1900, is shown from observations made by the United States Weather Bureau, according to the method originated by Prof. Todd. Results are given from May 15 to June 15 last, on the same plan as last year, and a third report will be issued in 1899. In general the line runs from New Orleans to Norfolk, with better probabilities in the northern portions of Georgia and Alabama, at the southern end of the Appalachian Mountains, than nearer the coast line in either direction—towards the Gulf or towards the Atlantic. In both years the percentage of cloudiness was three times greater near the coast than in those portions of the track lying in Georgia and Alabama. Stations a few miles southeast of Atlanta will be very favorably situated, and the railway service throughout the totality belt is ample.

—Under the modest title of a "bibliographical note" Miss Dixon has given a sketch of the 'Florentine Wool Trades in the Middle Ages,' issued by the Royal Historical Society. It is a most suggestive paper, imperfect as it confessedly is. Why should Florence, unfavorably situated for war or commerce, and far from any region where sheep-raising was an important industry, have come to occupy a leading position in the wool trade of mediæval Europe? Miss Dixon shows that it was the energy of the people that overcame enormous disadvantages. Certain Lombards, banished to North Germany early in the eleventh century, learned the art of wool-weaving, and formed an industrial and devout fraternity of the Umiliati. Returning to Italy after a few years, they continued their association, now recognized by the Pope as a religious order, and became influential through their business abilities. The Florentine Republic, alert for commercial advantage, invited them to come to Florence and establish a great training school of industry. Here they formed a local industry under the guilds of *Lana*, or wool, and *Calimala*, or merchants in foreign cloths. As the citizen of the time was bound to live within the city walls, he had a profound contempt for agriculture, and to encourage wool-raising would be beyond his comprehension. Hence it is that the laws of these republics bearing upon industrial life are full of foresight and good sense, while those bearing on agriculture or rural life seem dictated by prejudice and jealousy.

—Fine cloth could not be made from the coarse wool of Italy, and commercial conditions forbade the importation of fine wools from Spain, Flanders, or England. The Florentines began by buying the coarsely worked cloths of North Germany, and brought them home to refine and redye. "Before very long the merchants of *Calimala* were doing a brisk trade in cloth of excellent quality. *Torselli*, or great bales of rough foreign cloth, poured into Florence from Northwestern Europe, and were carded, sheared, cut, and dyed. By the preliminary operations the exterior roughness or outside layer was skilfully removed, and the result was a woollen cloth much finer than any of native Italian manufacture; capable of taking a most delicate dye. And in this latter branch also the Florentines speedily outdistanced all rivals. The cloth was now stretched, calendered, and rolled, and returned upon the market with a greatly enhanced value. At once it was in high demand in Italy; next it was exported to the East, and there exchanged for dyes, chemicals, and other products of Asia; and at length reappeared in the very markets of Northwestern Europe from which it had originally come." The rules of the guild were expressly framed to interfere with the liberty of the subject to cheat, and, with stringent police regulations against fraud or imperfect workmanship, the industry throve. With the increased demand it became profitable to import fine foreign wools, and the guild of *Lana*, forbidden to touch foreign fabrics, brought in the raw material which the *Calimala* was forbidden to fabricate. The trade in wool and cloths thus enabled a local manufacture to grow which soon overflowed the limits of the Republic, and controlled the wool trade of Europe for centuries. Had the Florentines imposed a prohibitive duty on wools and woollens to encourage the raising of sheep and the manufacture of cloths, they would never have enjoyed more than a local market. These *Arti* or guilds were not suppressed until 1770.

—Stopford Brooke's 'English Literature from the Beginning to the Norman Conquest' (Macmillan) is something better than a mere condensation of his 'History of Early

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

English Literature.' The later work presents 338 widely leaded pages to the 500 closely printed pages of the earlier; includes prose as well as poetry; and covers an additional period of a century and a half. Yet, through the excision of otiose matter and through observance of the laws of literary perspective, a cumbrous book has been made a well-regulated book, and there is no sense of loss. The main defect of the earlier work was the incessant outcropping of suggestive but frequently questionable speculation. We will not say that this abuse is entirely done away with in this volume, but it is very largely abated. The author is doubtless well-advised to centre the interest on the historical background and on the coloring of the sagas in the earlier period, where the materials are fragmentary, but the treatment here is still a bit too discursive and vague. We doubt, too, whether it is advisable in a work of this kind to make so much of the theory of the season-myth in the interpretation of "Beowulf." Two things in Mr. Brooke's treatment of Old English literature are conspicuous—insistence upon the feeling for nature in Anglo-Saxon poetry, and upon the importance of the Celtic element in English literature. To this last point the author recurs in the present volume with redoubled confidence and emphasis, placing the Celtic influence in importance far above the later French or Italian influence. Most readers will turn to the discussion of the question (throughout chapter i., and at pages 293 and following) as the matter of greatest actuality in the book. The speculation is ingeniously presented, but it still remains speculation. Mr. Brooke's style is sometimes dull, and there is a good deal of awkward English in the book: "refuged" (at pages 16 and 214), "delightsome" (23), "overworked" (for worked over, 44), "longish" (47), "couraging" (50), "as he *tops* the hill" (71), "ganging" and "gangers," *passim*, "*ulcerous* welter" (75), "peopleship" (78), "weirded" (79), "hosters" (90), "fleetingness" (158), "roomed" (169), "to ready" (178), "a recklessness all round of the present" and "a fierce and *claiming* individuality" (296), are locutions not to be encouraged. At the bottom of page 76 appears a sentence of uncomfortable levity, and misprints or other errors are to be noted at pages 204, 249, 250, and 296. A history of the Middle English period, to follow, is hinted at on page 35.

—Dr. Brandes's two new books—the one a volume of verse, 'Ungdomsvers,' the other a warm tribute of friendship to the late Julius Lange, the art historian—have each in their way been events of the season in the Scandinavian literary world. Indeed, the latter volume has already reached a second edition, no small tribute to a book in a little country like Denmark. In the charming letters which form the greater part of it, there is much pleasant and always original talk on art questions, there are interesting glimpses of people and places, and, above all, a delightful picture of a man of genial humor at the most interesting period of his life. Julius Lange, who died in 1896 at the age of fifty-eight, was one of the defining forces in modern Danish æsthetics and art criticism; these letters, however, come from a period anterior to his principal academic and literary activity. Those who may have tried to distil the Danish national character from the modern literature of Denmark will find something typically Danish in Lange. There was, as Dr. Brandes says, "something about him which might perhaps be described as the finest flower of the Danish nature, something very difficult to define, something which is bound up in the character of our language and our ideals, a concentrated essence of Danish earnestness and Danish playfulness, of Danish melancholy and Danish irony—something which is on that account never found outside of Denmark." It would be impertinent to say anything at this late date of Dr. Brandes's masterly power of making the people of whom he writes live again for us; but almost nowhere has this plastic, artistic side of his genius shown itself in such attractive colors as in this volume on his dead friend. With exemplary self-effacement, where self-effacement was difficult, he seems to have concentrated all his effort on painting an unforgettable portrait. One could, indeed, have wished that he had at times been less self-effacing; it would, for instance, have given the little book a new value had it been possible to publish the editor's share in the correspondence. But, with the exception of one letter, Lange had destroyed all Brandes's letters to him which might have been included here.

—In the volume of youthful poetry, whose appearance we have already mentioned, it is also the personal element that attracts us most. One misses in the majority of these little poems the singing qualities of the born lyric poet; only occasionally do we feel that the poet's inner life has found its happiest mode of expression in the lyric. But, none the less, these poems have a deep interest for us as the personal "confessions" of an intellectual leader of men. They, too, mirror the struggles of the young Denmark of thirty years ago to get out into the main stream of European thought. The note that recurs most frequently in these poems is a note of defiance: "Trods alt!' (In spite of everything!). No one in our time has earned more worthily the honor to be numbered among Heine's "soldiers in the Liberation War of Humanity" than Georg Brandes. But there are fighters and fighters. In the modern world there are still plenty of soldiers of the old Thirty Years' War type, soldiers to whom fighting is the business and joy of life. But there are others upon whose nature battle is forced as a kind of Hamlet task; every blow they strike leaves a furrow upon their souls, every battle won is won at an inner sacrifice. Is it too much to see in the personality these lyric confessions disclose, one of these essentially modern "Ritter des heiligen Geistes," fiery and highstrung, but with the sensitive soul of the poet and the artist?

LOWELL, PAST AND PRESENT.

Loom and Spindle; or, Life among the Early Mill Girls. By Harriet H. Robinson. Boston: T. Y. Crowell & Co. 1898.

This little book makes its appeal to many classes of readers. It tells a tale which is quite true, in a style which is as attractive as it is sincere and unaffected; it describes a very curious phase of factory life in this country which is likely to remain unique; and it adds some characteristic traits and glimpses of the New England spirit and manners in the early part of the century. Its vivid reminiscences of Lowell sixty years ago will also, of course, especially appeal to the recollection of those who knew that town before the fifties, or those who are interested in its chronicles and antiquities.

Mrs. Robinson was one of that remarkable band of young women who came to Lowell when the cotton manufactory was first started in this country. She thought Lowell a small Utopia at that time, though Mr. Bellamy would have severely criticised many of its regulations. On the other hand, the girls themselves would have been very much astonished at Mr. Bellamy's notion of an honest day's work. They came from homes in the country, "the flowers gathered from a thousand hillsides and green valleys of New England," as Whittier called them in a flowery rhetorical burst; but these lilies of the field were more than willing to toil and spin, and relaxed themselves with literary labors when their long day's work was over. They were mostly of a strong and superior Yankee stock. Mrs. Robinson came of a family of Quakers who settled first in Dover, N. H., in 1705; her great-grandfather, William Brown of Cambridge, sold to the corporation of Harvard College a large portion of the present site of the university buildings. She had, therefore, in common with many of her mates, that strain of blue blood which is not recognized in the peerage lists, but which has left its positive trace in so many Western hamlets and institutions, and which contributed so profoundly to the success of our early experiment in democracy. This class of girls—a picked class—dropped down into the midst of an artificially protected life, which happened to suit, in some respects, their previous training and habits. They were a community under special rules and control. The boarding-houses were provided by the manufacturing company, whose officials claimed and maintained a semi-autocratic oversight over the habits and morals of their employees. These officials were, however, educated and able gentlemen of high character, and the general intent of their despotism was judicious and benevolent. The corporation required children under fourteen to attend school three months in the year. The girls were required by their contract to attend some religious service regularly; they were even at first obliged to contribute a small monthly sum towards the support of the "Established Church" (the Episcopal); and finally, when they quit work, they received an honorable discharge.

These somewhat intrusive regulations worked well enough, because they fell in with the temper and bringing up of the girls, who were disposed to carry them out obediently. The boarding-houses were comfortable, and were at first subsidized by the corporation; the life in them was moral and marked by a certain degree of refinement. "The young ladies," says Dickens, "had the use of pianos." They had also the characteristic Yankee thirst for knowledge and self-culture. They snatched a moment from their work at the loom to read or to commit to memory a poem; they were not too tired in the evening to attend lectures, and to flatter the lecturer by taking notes assiduously. They founded the earliest women's clubs in the country for mutual improvement, and they edited and published for some years the *Lowell Offering*, a periodical which was noticed in England and France, in which Mrs. Robinson first practised her skilful pen, and which was quite as good literature as the "Friendship's Garlands" and the "Elegant Extracts" that were current at the time. A large part of this exuberant intel-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lectual activity was undoubtedly due to the natural bent of Puritan strain and Yankee energy. It was in the blood. One might still board the train from Lowell to Boston a few years ago, and hear the ancient pop-corn peddler inquire, "Wa'al, how did you like the lecture last night?"

Mrs. Robinson fell in love with her life on the Merrimack, and apparently even with the factory régime. She thinks that the present factory-girls might renew the same intellectual interests which she and her friends once pursued, and that the Utopia of her recollections might be charmed into existence once more. She tells of a visit made to Lowell not long ago. She found the boarding-houses rather dilapidated, the work in certain rooms trying on account of the heat. She thinks the status of the factory population is reduced from what it was in her time. She addressed the young women at the "People's Club." She thought they looked tired and hopeless; "it was plainly to be seen that they did not go to their labor with the jubilant feeling the old mill-girls used to have; that their work was drudgery done without aim or purpose." She believes that the present "corporations" are at fault, and recommends as a solution of the perplexities of the cotton factories the system which prevailed in her own time. "It embraced the then novel idea that corporations have souls and should exercise a paternal influence over the lives of their operatives." This, indeed, is the thesis of her closing chapter. She speaks of the factory as her "alma mater," and of her life as a "lost Eden," which she wishes she could restore to the workers of the present day.

A year's residence in Lowell and some accurate observation would give Mrs. Robinson good reason to change her opinion, and to take a very different view of the situation. Times have changed since she lived in this city of spindles, but they have changed almost exclusively for the better. We are convinced that the present factory-girls would not tolerate the Eden which she recommends. Its enchantment lives largely in Mrs. Robinson's memories of the distant morning of youth. The wonder is, in fact, that she and her mates could stand such work and such play, and where they got their nerves of steel and their Amazonian constitutions. The secret, however, is a simple one. They came fresh from the country, they took long vacations, and, as a rule, they did not come to stay. Their labor in the factory was only an episode. Mrs. Robinson, when she was ten years old, began work at five in the morning and quit it at seven in the evening; she complains that she never could make up the sleep which that little girl of ten lost in the mornings. The actual working-day was then thirteen hours—it is now ten; the time for meals is longer now; no work at all is done on Saturday afternoon. No child under fourteen is allowed by law to be employed at all. Thoughtful employers have seen that it pays to keep the operatives physically and mentally fit for their work. They have co-operated in securing the enactment of enlightened legislation which applies not only to hours, but to safety and sanitary measures. The boarding-houses have fallen into decay because the boarding-house system has fallen gradually into disuse. Instead of these, the tendency—an entirely natural and proper one—is for families to make homes, and these homes are, as a rule, detached and surrounded by a plot of ground.

The danger of overcrowding which Mrs. Robinson apprehends, exists in only one spot in Lowell, and that is in the settlement known as "Little Canada"; but this place is really only a half-way house for new arrivals. Of this spot a French Canadian house-builder observes: "A Canadian family moves in there and sleeps all together till they have a hundred dollars; then they buy a cottage and move out and another set moves in." Even in this crowded spot, the pitched battles which Mrs. Robinson describes so truthfully as once taking place every day on "The Acre," would not now be tolerated by public sentiment, not to speak of the police. That Irish settlement, "The Acre," its shanties and its riots, are things of the past. It is now built up with decent habitations, and its occupants are as a rule decent and orderly citizens. The fact is that the process of education and amelioration which Mrs. Robinson so earnestly and honestly desires (and all of us too, for that matter), is steadily going on and showing itself in the younger generation. They do not go in for literature, perhaps; but their energy and enterprise are shown in other directions; they have an honorable ambition and self-respect, they like their children to dress better and to stand higher in the social scale than they did themselves. Any one who lives in the city and keeps his eyes open, will notice these changes going on in his neighborhood. The Canadians, in particular, are thrifty, industrious, and clever; one sees among them often the employee transformed into employer, the mason or carpenter into the builder and contractor, the laborer into the capitalist. The partition that divides these two characters is in our country very thin and removable; both are, in fact, often taken by the same man, and it cannot reasonably be supposed that, in such cases, he plays alternately the part of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.

Yet this is exactly what Mrs. Robinson implies in her appeals to mill-owners and managers. She entreats them to beware of strikes, to avoid "degrading their working-people to the level of the same class in other countries, and to mix a little conscience with their capital," as if mill-owners and managers lived in another sphere, and were made of different flesh and blood from the working-people; whereas, they have in most cases sprung from the ranks themselves. In point of fact, next to his business (or, rather, as a vital part of his business), the manager of a successful mill must nowadays study human nature—the nature, the needs, and the feelings of his employees. If he does not do this from humanity, he must do it from policy. He must study his employees as he knows and studies the market. If he fails to understand them sympathetically, he is apt to knock his head against a wall. The manager is constantly beset with two problems, how to keep the factory running with a return to the stockholders, and at the same time to be fair—to be liberal, if possible—to the employees. The skilful manager knows perfectly well the constant menace and peril of strikes; he must study constantly the character and wishes of his "hands," who are really, in a sense, his hands to work out the designs of his brains. He must be keen and shrewd and close if he is to run his mill and make dividends; he must at the same time be as liberal to his workmen as the markets will permit. If he oversteps his line on either side, he comes to grief—he must either shut up his mill for want of a market, or have it shut up by a strike. This is the real state of things; employers and employed all turn round and move geared to the same iron wheels of necessity. We have in mind at this moment a large woollen manufactory which is closed for three months. The shut-down brings distress and privation upon the population of a small town. Yet it is owned by a family of most genuine philanthropists, who deeply sympathize with their people and have an enlightened aim and desire to improve their lot. They dare not make up goods which they cannot sell.

Those who have had most experience know best the difficulty of exercising "a protecting care and parental influence over the operatives." What the operatives want first and foremost is just and fair dealing; what they want next is to be let alone. They love independence, they dislike interference, they tolerate benevolence only in misfortune, and in its most disguised and delicate forms. Some years ago there was in Connecticut a manufactory which in various ways seemed to offer an ideal pattern of the sort which Mrs. Robinson is seeking. The building and the grounds were decorated with flowers, the skylights were of stained glass, lunches were provided for the younger people, and all this was done by the manager with the best intentions. Yet, strange to say, these arrangements were a failure—the results were as unsatisfactory to the operatives as to the stockholders. The operatives felt that they were on exhibition, and their pride was offended, and the régime did not pay the stockholders. Something of the same feeling mingled with the various grievances at Pullman. The workman hated the Platonic tyranny of this neat and convenient Utopia that thrust its regulations so persistently upon his domestic life and privacy. It sat upon him as uneasily as an evening suit might, when he wanted to smoke his pipe in his shirt-sleeves.

The problem of the cotton-mill, which Mrs. Robinson thinks may be solved by the operation of the golden rule, is really very much like that of the deserted farms in New Hampshire. Who would have thought, thirty years ago, of Southern competition in the print manufacture? Yet if the New England factories hold their own at all now, it is because they have the "right of way"—the possession of the market, the control of abundance of skilled and highly trained labor, the momentum of enormous capital, the inertia of heavy investments in costly plants. The Southern mills have, in many cases, coal on the spot at one-third the price in Lowell, and cotton on the spot, the fibre of which remains one "grade" higher than after packing and transportation to the North. They have laborers who are at present glad to work longer hours for lower wages; they are less trammelled by Legislatures and the meddling of guilds. Who can fight long against the bounty and the favoritism of nature? The New Hampshire farms no longer raise wheat; the New England factories may have to abandon cotton.

But if they do give up this manufacture, it will not be because of any deterioration in the fineness and quality of their goods. Mrs. Robinson misses the old-fashioned calicos which "wore like iron" and lasted in Protean forms through several generations. The very same quality could be furnished by the calico-printers in endless bales on two

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

months' notice, and no one would be better pleased than the printers themselves. But the printers are slaves who wait on the caprices of fashion. Nobody wants this class of goods now. The ladies want variety, they want new styles, they would be alarmed at the prospect of a gingham's wearing them a lifetime. They demand the tasteful fabrics and designs which have been multiplied within the last twenty or thirty years. They can afford to wear two or three new dresses for the price of the single gown of their grandmothers. If the people look to England for woollens, as Mrs. Robinson says, and for silks to Lyons and Zurich, the question is, Why should they? There is more silk and less lead in a pound of American silks than in the silks of Lyons or Zurich; there is less shoddy in our inferior woollens than in the same class of English goods. Our manufacturers have never taken kindly to shoddy and pipe-clay. This is the sober truth and is certainly not discreditable.

Our remarks apply strictly to the social conditions of Lowell, and our criticism solely to some unguarded statements and generalizations of Mrs. Robinson's final chapter. Her reminiscences form; as we have said, a particularly vivacious and accurate sketch of an experience that was well worth recording. Such a picture of hard and honest and cheerful toil, combined with self-respecting independence, forms a charming and suggestive contrast to those lurid diagnoses which Mr. Wyckoff has lately been giving us of the agonies and the vicissitudes of the amateur workingman.

LANE'S LATIN GRAMMAR.

A Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges. By George M. Lane, Professor Emeritus of Latin in Harvard University. Harper & Bros. 1898. Pp. xvi, 572.

It has been said that the desire to write books is immanent in every Latin teacher. The number of Latin grammars, large and small, of Latin primers, readers, lessons, and foundations, which are constantly appearing seems to bear out the assertion. The late Prof. Lane was a great teacher rather than a great writer. He left his impress upon hundreds of pupils, who respected the accuracy and breadth of his scholarship and felt the charm of his personality. For thirty years, during the intervals of teaching, he was engaged in the preparation of a Latin grammar considerable portions of which were in print many years before his death and subjected to repeated revision. The appearance of the work was awaited with impatience by many scholars who knew the superior qualifications of the author. Unhappily, it was not permitted him to give it the finishing touch, but it was so far advanced towards completion that one of his younger colleagues, a former pupil, Prof. Morris H. Morgan, has with loyal devotion carried the book through the press within a year after the author's death. The chapter on versification was written at Prof. Lane's request by a former pupil, Dr. Herman W. Hayley, but was not revised by Prof. Lane. Parts of the book—namely, pages 303 to 373 and 387 to 436—were left by Prof. Lane only in the condition of a first draught. Here the editor has conscientiously kept, so far as possible, the original language of the statement of syntactical principles, but has made some additions and modifications for the sake of completeness. Some seventy sections are due wholly to him.

It need hardly be said that the work bears upon every page the evidence of Prof. Lane's accurate scholarship, and of his constant endeavor to make the statements conform to the actual facts of the language as represented in the existing monuments. Forms found in inscriptions are given as well as those occurring in the literature. Statistics of usage, often stated very briefly, bear witness to a microscopic examination of various authors. It is to be regretted that Prof. Lane could not have written a preface explaining more fully the scope of his work, and the extent to which he had endeavored to represent the usage of different periods. The list of writers given on pages 486 and 487, although it includes Macrobius, shows that he did not intend to go much below Tacitus and Suetonius. Indeed, in section 777 the term "late writers" is applied to Lucan, Quintilian, Tacitus, Juvenal, Martial, and Pliny, whereas we should prefer to reserve it for a still later period. We must not, then, expect to find here the deviations in later syntactical usage which ought to have a place in a complete historical grammar. All the passages quoted in illustration are translated, and there is a charm and exquisite flavor about the versions which bespeak the finished scholar. Indeed, the excellent treatment of syntax might be read purely for literary enjoyment by one not especially interested in syntax.

Although the book is admirably printed, its attractiveness is marred by the predominance of fine type, necessary for the inclusion of so much matter. It is not a grammar for beginners, but will be most valuable for advanced students, and indispensable for teachers. The very full index referring to the sections, 2745 in all, makes it very convenient for reference. It may be noted here that the terminology often differs from that current in the ordinary grammars. We have "person endings" and "gender accusatives." One will look in vain for the "ethical dative" or the "historical infinitive," which have been newly dubbed "the emotional dative" and "the infinitive of intimation." A nice distinction is drawn between the Present of Vivid Narration (1590) and the Annalistic Present (1591). The Vocative gets scant recognition as a case. In 419, nouns are said to have five cases, but immediately afterwards, with a slight inconsistency, we are told that "All cases but the nominative and vocative are called *Oblique Cases*." That there should be some inconsistencies and errors in so comprehensive a work is not surprising. Glaring mistakes are not easy to find. Great care has been taken to indicate the quantity wherever long; and while one may question sometimes the accuracy of the hidden quantities assigned, which the reviewer is disposed to do in more than one instance, yet one is glad to have upon this difficult point the opinion of so careful a scholar as Prof. Lane. When *classis*, however, is printed in 521 (so Bennett) and *clāsse* in 555 (so Marx), one is left in doubt as to Prof. Lane's real opinion. The index, prepared by Dr. Walden, gives *classis*.

To sound-change more attention than usual is given. The statements, however, are brief and sometimes lack scientific precision, while the explanations and discussions which make Lindsay's work on the Latin Language so valuable, are of course wanting. The dates given (28) for the doubling of vowels to indicate length, namely, from 134-74 B. C., need modification in view of the Curubis inscription of the year 49 B. C., discovered in 1894, in which both VAARVS and POSTEICVVS occur. Examples, moreover, of *uu* occur much later; *e. g.*, FVVCO in a *tessera lusoria* of the Imperial age.

In 30, the apex (′) is said to have been turned by grammarians into the horizontal mark (—), but that this is actually found in inscriptions (*e. g.*, Corp. VI. 8979) is not stated. The statements in 65 relative to the retention of final long vowels in early Latin need to be entirely revised. Evidently older authorities are here followed, and the views of Klotz and Lindsay are not recognized. To speak of *o* being weakened to *e* in *bellus* from *bonus* (76) is not scientifically exact, nor is the *e* of the vocative *serve* specifically Latin. In 81 it would have been well to indicate that the change of *au* to *u* in *cludo* is not direct, but rather due to the analogy of the compounds. In 86 the explanation of the future *regemus* from **regaimus* is unsatisfactory. *Nolo* in 100 and 775 is said to be from *non volo* instead of from *ne volo*. In 103 *socors* is given with the first *o* long. Havet and Solmsen regard it as short, as it certainly is in Prudentius. Exception may be taken to the form of the statement in 118: "Initial *b* sometimes comes from *v*, before which a *d* has disappeared, as, *dvonos bonus*." In 130 nothing is said about the aversion of Latin to two *r*'s in successive syllables. *Muliebris* is not from *mulierbris; praestigiae* for *praestrigiae* furnishes a better example.

In 139 and 747 the old second singular of *sum* is given as *ēs* for *ess*, but probably it was never pronounced *ēs* in early Latin, but rather *ees* before vowels. A similar explanation applies to *mīlēs* given in 2465. We question the propriety of speaking of final *s* being lost in *iste, ille, ipse* (142), or of *abs* becoming *ab*. The statement in 146 and 350 that *t* of the suffix *-timo* sometimes becomes *r*, as in *pauperrimus*, sometimes *l*, as in *humillimus*, is misleading, and the assertion (148) that *n* becomes *m*, as in *accumbo, rumpo*, certainly needs further explanation. *Publicus* can hardly be regarded as coming from *poplicus* (151). Under the first declension, forms like *drachmum* and *amphorum* should be distinctly mentioned. PROSEPNAIS (443) ought not to be given as a genitive form, for the *s* formerly read in the inscription is now recognized to be a lock of hair, as Prof. Lane knew perfectly well, for he used to say wittily that the form turned upon a hair. The genitive in *ā* is said to occur once in inscriptions, COIRA. A second instance, VESTA, occurs in a similar inscription first published in 1895. The form *Sardeis* cited in 461 is by no means certain as a nominative. In 478 *lact* should also be given, the form being attested for Varro. In 663 it is implied that the forms *huice, hunce*, and *harunce* are frequent in the dramatists, which is not the case. The derivation of *nuper* in 698 from **novomper* cannot be defended. In 749 *insens* from *insum* found in an inscription should be added to *absens* and *praesens*.

The list of verbs with the principal parts actually found in use is quite complete, although forms found in the later period, and some of those attested by grammarians for the early period, *e. g.*, *meminens*, are not included. Deponent verbs receive rather scant treatment in 798 ff. and elsewhere, and not

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sufficient attention is given to the active forms found. In 1006 *absorpsi* should be credited to Lucan and Macrobius, and *exsorpsi* to Seneca. In 1092 Afranius's use of *absente nobis* should be noticed.

In 1146 the range of usage of expressions like *id genus, hoc genus*, originally appositives, which are wholly wanting in some writers, is not indicated; *e. g.*, they are not found in Plautus and Terence, and occur first in Cato and Lucilius. The dative of purpose deserves a fuller treatment than it receives in 1223-25. The dative of comparison with *inferior* found in Sallust is not mentioned. In the treatment of the Ablative of Comparison in 1320, no mention is made of the ablative after *malle* as in Horace S. 2, 8, 79. To the genitive of comparison and the ablative with *ab*, no reference is made, as these belong to a period later than the one surveyed.

In 1380 Cato should be named as using the accusative with *abutor*. The example of *clam* (1415) with the ablative in Cæsar B. C. 2, 32, 8, is called in question by Wölfflin, who, however, is wrong in denying the construction for later prose. Lactantius has *clam Saturno*, and Macrobius has *clam ceteris* and *clam vulgo*. For the use of *absque* with the ablative, no examples are given in 1421. To the passages given for *noenu* in 1444, Tyrell would add Cicero *ad Att.* vii, 3, 10, but Mueller, in his edition just published, does not admit it. The historical infinitive, happily named (1534) "the infinitive of intimation," might be treated more historically. It is wholly lacking in Suetonius. Although it is true that two or more infinitives are usually combined, Fronto even using seventeen in succession, still Tacitus uses sixty such infinitives singly, and once he uses it with *donec*, a fact not stated in 1539. In 1551 no sharp distinction is drawn between the use of the present and perfect subjunctives in prohibitions. The use of *necesse est* with *ut* and the subjunctive is not recognized in 1709 or 1965.

A good example of the concise statement of the usage of different writers is found in 1827: "With *quippe qui* the indicative only is used by Sallust, and is preferred by Plautus and Terence. Cicero has, with one exception, the subjunctive, Tacitus and Nepos have it always, Livy has either mood. Not in Cæsar." As Tacitus and Nepos have each only one case of *quippe* followed by a relative, the word "always" is a little misleading. Moreover, the *quippe qui* of Plautus is different from the *quippe quem* of Nepos. It might be added that *quippe qui* occurs once with the subjunctive in the 'Bellum Africum.' In 1879 *utpote cum* is said to be used twice in Cicero's Letters, but in one of the passages, *ad Fam.* 10, 32, 4, Pollio is the writer. The treatment of conditional periods is somewhat disappointing, although the possible varieties of protasis and apodosis are fully illustrated by examples. Here we miss the author's final revision.

The treatment of the infinitive used as a substantive in 2205 and 2215 should have more illustrations. That Cicero was the first to use it with *inter*, and Horace the first with *praeter*, might well be mentioned. In 2398 *quisquis* for *quisque* is illustrated by a Ciceronian passage in which the more common *quidquid* occurs. *Quisquis*, however, is found in Cicero *ad Fam.* vi, 1, 1 (Mendelssohn).

The chapter on Versification is excellent. Both theories of the Saturnian verse are given, but no attempt is made to decide between them. In the list of authors and their works (pp. 486 and 487) there are many slips of quantity. *Vidularia* has the support of the dictionaries, but the *i* is long. Other errors of quantity elsewhere might be pointed out, but the wonder is that they are so few.

We cannot close this notice without giving some specimens of the translations which lend the book a distinct literary value. In 1450 a line of a well-known inscription, *heic est sepulcrum hau pulcrum pulcrai feminae*, is rendered "Here is the site not sightly of a sightly dame." In 1620 Chaucer is pressed into service, *cantabit vacuus coram latrone viator*, "The pourë man whan he goth by the weye, bifore the thevës he may synge and pleye." Under the emotional dative, 1211, *at tibi repente, cum minime exspectarem, venit ad me Caninius mane*, "But bless you, sir, when I least dreamt of it, who should drop in on me all at once but Caninius, bright and early." In 1352, *quae hic monstra fiunt, anno vix possum eloqui*, "What ghost transactions take place here, I scarce could tell you in a year." In 1319, *curatus inaequali tonsore capillos*, "My locks by unsymmetric barber trimmed." In 1216, *nulla placere diu nec vivere carmina possunt, quae scribuntur aquae potoribus*, "No verse can take or be long lived that by teetotallers is writ." This rivals in brevity even the Latin.

THE CALIFORNIA HISTORIANS.

History of California. By Theodore H. Hittell. San Francisco: N. J. Stone & Co. 1897. Four volumes, pp. 799, 823, 981, and 858.

The completion of Mr. Hittell's interesting history is a literary event of importance to all students, especially in these days of territorial expansion. Those who wish to know more about Spanish methods of governing colonies, and also about American methods of dealing with people of Spanish stock, will do well to refresh their memories of the California records. Mr. Hittell's first two volumes were duly reviewed in these columns in March and July, 1886. The two volumes since added carry the story to the close of Gov. Bartlett's administration in 1887, with allusions to events as late as 1895. The fourth volume concludes with a very complete general index of 134 pages. It is evident that Mr. Hittell has done much and faithful work for many years upon his book, which probably represents the largest result yet obtained by any one man's unaided work in historical writing about California.

Although the methods of Bancroft and Hittell are very different, no review of the present work can be complete without a brief comparison of their results. It becomes more necessary from the fact that both Bancroft and Hittell, though fellow-workers in the same ample field, have ignored or decried each other. The saddest thing in Mr. Hittell's book is his reference to the attempt made in 1887 to have the State purchase the Bancroft library. Here he notes as legislative history the mere appearance of a bill soon withdrawn and never voted upon, in order to call the manuscripts of the Bancroft collection "of little value" and "unreliable." Few Californians favored the purchase of the Bancroft collection, and the futile effort to sell it does not deserve any place in a dignified history of the State, while any attempt to belittle the importance of that collection, so rich in original documents, can only injure Mr. Hittell's own standing. There seems to be no reason to think that the older historian of California can be superseded by his rival, although it is plain that students must consult both, and will find Hittell particularly useful for the period after 1850. Mr. Bancroft's seven regular and several supplementary volumes, such as "California Pastoral," "Inter Pocula," and much of his "Popular Tribunals" taken collectively, form a great storehouse of historical material. It is unfortunately true that large portions of Bancroft's history are not easily readable, while a much greater offence against sound literature results from the composite nature of the authorship. For these and lesser, more local, reasons a somewhat unjust but very natural reaction against Bancroft has taken place, especially in California itself. After this generation has passed away, the great wealth of material accessible to and used by Bancroft, especially in relation to the period before the Conquest, will certainly give his work (despite its lack of personal unity) a place of primary importance for students of early California history.

But Mr. Hittell's peculiar virtues, which show to better advantage in the later than in the earlier volumes of his book, will probably attract more readers than Bancroft's, and will make at least his later volumes indispensable to the historian. Briefly, these virtues are those of a trained lawyer, unusually well versed in land-matters and in legislative proceedings. His accounts of mission secularization and of Spanish and Mexican land-grants constitute some of the most valuable portions of his two earlier volumes. So also, in the last two, whatever touches upon law or the administration of law is told in a quiet, careful, deliberate, and wholly convincing way. In this extensive field, therefore, the present reviewer, after rereading the greater part of Bancroft and Hittell, in order to refresh his memory and compare style and methods, must rank Hittell as easily Bancroft's superior. With a few exceptions, Mr. Hittell's entire fourth volume on State administrations, and large parts of his third volume, are models of trustworthy, impartial historical writing. His account of the pioneer California of the gold-miners, and of the two vigilance committees, deserves more extended notice than space will permit. We quote his description of the manner in which the vigilantes, on Sunday, May 18, 1856, surrounded the jail, after James King of William had been shot:

"The different companies started about noon, and, marching by different routes, took up their various positions. There were about fifteen hundred men under arms. Some marched up Kearney Street, others up Dupont Street, and still others up Stockton Street. When they halted, most found themselves upon Broadway Street in front of or near the jail. They came together with admirable, almost mathematical precision; and, as they fell into position, they of course understood what was intended. It was an extraordinary spectacle. The whole place was closely invested by armed men, not, indeed, in uniform, but with muskets and bayonets flashing in the brilliant sunlight. Some few had hunting-rifles or shotguns, and one tall Nantucket whaleman, besides a navy revolver in his belt, carried a harpoon and several fathoms of rope on his shoulder. Around, and as it were hemming in all, crowding the streets, covering the summit and vacant slopes of Telegraph Hill and the neighboring roofs, and filling porticoes and windows, were dense masses of people, eager to see what was to be done and hushed in expectation."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Although we find Hittell's narrative generally clear, interesting, and reliable, and though we often prefer his conclusions to those of Bancroft, there is yet a certain quality of distinction lacking in both alike. In truth it is more or less lacking in many other ponderous and authoritative histories and is often found in less pretentious volumes; the quality which Prof. Wilson of Princeton once called "mere literature." Royce's little History of California, for instance, raised a storm of criticism west of the Sierras when it first appeared, and indeed it is only what it purports to be—a study of American character as shown in California during the ten years after the Conquest. Certainly, then, it cannot be reckoned with as a complete history. But it contains some word-pictures of men and scenes that should long live in California literature; it brings home to the meanest understanding such merciless analyses of motives, such brilliant generalizations, that the whole story is illuminated. Note this, for instance, written by Royce some time in 1884, and observe the historical foresight. (It is apropos of the Bear Flag episode):

"For my part, if ever I hear in future of our great national mission on this continent as civilizers of the Spanish-American peoples, if ever I find that this mission has come once more, as it surely some day will come, to the surface of our vainglorious national consciousness, I shall be able to think of nothing but poor Ide, the self-appointed Yankee captain of a chance crowd of marauders, standing benevolently in the 'calaboose,' before the forty or fifty innocent and imprisoned citizens of Sonoma, and feeling in his devout kindliness that he does God service while he bellows to them an unintelligible harangue, 'not a twentieth part interpreted,' about man's inalienable rights to liberty and equality, and while he concludes with a reference to Washington, believing himself meanwhile to be the Father of the Bear Flag Republic."

Not only the general reader, but the historian as well, must find in Royce's brief accounts of the first constitutional convention, of the vigilance committee of 1856, of land-title troubles and other things besides the Bear Flag, two especial virtues, the literary quality and the courage to draw striking conclusions. Therefore in Royce, more than in Hittell or Bancroft, and much more than in the yet unpublished 'California History to 1849' of the late Gen. Halleck, there are living men such as Ide, Gwin, Semple, Frémont, Broderick, Terry, and a score of others. One may, and often does, differ with Royce's views of these men, but his character-sketches are not easily forgotten.

Returning to Mr. Hittell's work, it is a pity that the earlier volumes, stereotyped in 1885, could not have been rewritten. Revision should have modified the romantic view of Résanoff's courtship of Señorita Argüello, and could hardly have failed to improve his unsatisfactory account of the Portola expedition of 1769-70, chronicled by Father Crespi. Even Bancroft's incomplete geographical note on this expedition leaves room for considerable original investigation hereafter. The interesting exploring expedition of Capt. Luis Argüello in 1821 up the Jesus Maria (Sacramento) valley nearly or quite to the Shasta and Trinity region has been entirely overlooked by Hittell. Padre Blas Ordaz was the chaplain and historian of this journey.

Mr. Hittell's views as to what does or does not belong to a history of California are sometimes eccentric. His nearly 3,500 pages are none too many to contain a complete narrative upon the scale he has attempted, and he should have no room for the irrelevant. Perhaps he may be excused for digressing to summarize the events of the Coronado expedition, or even to describe the capture of Guayaquil by Cavendish, and the South Sea Bubble, though a trained literary conscience would have discarded these outside particulars. But by what logic does he include the story of the captivity of the Oatman girls, and why, in the chapter devoted to Col. Mason, does he minutely review the events of the Mexican War? Lastly, and chiefly, why does he, in volume iv., in chapters ostensibly devoted to the administrations of Governors Stanford and Lowe, give the reader upwards of twenty-eight pages upon the campaigns of the Civil War? Here, under page-headings of "State Administration," one can, for ten pages at a time, look in vain for a single word referring even remotely to California. It seems hardly necessary to say that sound literary judgment would have clung closely to the work in hand, avoiding these curiously useless notes on the campaigns of Grant and Lee.

It follows, perhaps inevitably, from Mr. Hittell's division of his subject into books as well as chapters, that some material falls into the wrong places. The worst case of this occurs in chapter x. of book x., "Agricultural and Horticultural Advance." The first three pages of this chapter relate to such discoveries as that of the Geysers, and have nothing to do with the title. When new plates are called for, there should be a thorough revision of several chapters so as to bring into closer relationship materials that belong together. If Mr. Hittell could have had some editorial training and sat in judgment upon other men's articles, his own arrangement of topics would have been better than it is. Lastly, when Mr. Hittell, or his publishers, decided to bring out these four stately volumes without even one map, a serious blunder was made.

The Control of the Tropics. By Benjamin Kidd. Macmillan. 1898.

The argument of this little book, by the well-known author of 'Social Evolution,' may be summed up briefly as follows: The trade of the world, and especially of England and the United States, with the tropics is of immense importance. By "the tropics" the author expressly wishes to have understood (p. 8) the belt of territory on either side of the equator within the parallels of 30° north and 30° south. The trade of the United States with the countries lying within this belt he puts at £70,000,000. The trade of the United Kingdom with the same region he makes £138,000,000, the sum total of the two being £208,000,000. The combined trade of the United Kingdom and the United States with the remainder of the world outside English-speaking lands he puts at £473,000,000, so that their combined trade with the tropics is about 44 per cent. of their trade with the rest of the world. The "complex life of the modern world," therefore, "rests upon the production of the tropics to an extent which is scarcely realized by the average mind." Now the existing relations of all civilized nations to this important region "may be resolved into three types" (p. 20). The first is that of which the best example is furnished by the Dutch and Spanish possessions in the East and West Indies. Here the territory is regarded as an estate—a plantation of the mother country, to be worked for the largest profit it will bring, mainly irrespective of other considerations. This system is wholly wrong, according to our ideas, but we must admit that, "given the conditions which allowed of capital being invested and of labor being applied to tropical regions, even under this system there are unmistakable proofs of a large production and a large resulting trade" (p. 24). The second type is that of French and German colonization, which is also based on the estate or plantation theory, but which is peculiar in having for the principal field of development the continent of Africa, where expansion for white races is impossible.

We do not ourselves perceive any substantial difference between Mr. Kidd's first and second types, but there is an undoubted difference in the results—the Dutch and Spanish Indies having turned out revenue-yielding estates, the French and German experiments in Africa having proved very unprofitable investments; but this is immaterial to our author's argument, which is really based on the essential difference between both the first types and the third or English system (Mr. Kidd, without explaining the grounds of his assertion, says that this is, or will be, also the system of the United States). In this the idea of working a colony as an estate or plantation is abandoned; it is governed by a small staff of experts in its own interest, and it is allowed to trade with all the world. A generation ago there was an idea prevalent in England that its tropical colonies would become self-governing, but the native races are incapable of self-government. The United States has also been a victim of the same mistake, for it has allowed (in South America) the establishment of several so-called nations which are incapable of good administration of the functions of government, and consequently "the resources which their inhabitants have in charge remain undeveloped and practically beyond the reach of civilization" (p. 44).

The world is filling up with population, and "the rivalry and struggle for the trade of the tropics will, beyond doubt, be the permanent underlying fact in the foreign relations of the Western nations in the twentieth century," and any future policy as to the tropics must be based on a recognition of the following facts: first, the attempt to acclimatize the white man in the tropics must be abandoned as a blunder; second, the management of any tropical region as an estate must be given up; third, we must admit that the tropics cannot govern themselves; fourth, the tropics "can only be governed as a trust for civilization and with a full sense of the responsibility which such a trust involves" (p. 53). But the only race which has shown any capacity to govern these regions in such a way as to promote the interests of civilization is the Anglo-Saxon race, *e. g.*, in India and Egypt. The conclusion would seem to be that the Anglo-Saxon race ought to control the tropics, or that portion of the world between 30 degrees north and 30 degrees south latitude.

The map of the world shows that what Mr. Kidd calls "the tropics" embraces the following countries or parts of countries—a southern fraction of China, most of India, Siam, French Indo-China, the Dutch and Spanish East Indies, the larger part of Australia, most of Mexico, Central Ameri-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ca, the West Indies, part of the United States, most of South America, a slice of Persia, and most of Arabia. His argument appears to relate to "colonies," but this is a term which he stretches so as to cover the South American states, which were formerly colonies, but are so no longer. We are to understand, therefore, that whenever in these regions it appears that a country exists the resources of which are not developed, as they might be, according to their highest standards of production, the United States or England, or both, are to supplant or override the existing government, and assume control of it as "a trust for civilization."

We confess we are unable to perceive either continuity or coherence in this argument. It rests on three premises—the overcrowding of the world with population, the consequent necessity of expansion for trade, and the unfitness of any government in the world except that of England or the United States to be a "trustee for civilization" between 30 degrees north and 30 degrees south latitude. But so far as this country is concerned, the world is not overcrowded, but underpopulated, there being room in it for the entire population of England several times over. Mr. Kidd may not know it, but he can easily rent an excellent farm in Illinois (or, if he prefers the Eastern States, a farm with good buildings in Massachusetts) almost on his own terms. But if it were overcrowded, how would the expansion of trade with countries in which the white races cannot permanently settle cure overcrowding? The trade of England with India expands, but it does not relieve the pressure of population. In the third place, the unfitness of other governments to be "trustees for civilization" between 30 degrees north and 30 degrees south latitude is not admitted by them.

The only sense in which England is better fitted to be a "trustee for civilization" is that, under English rule, trade is free; there is greater freedom politically, and better security for life, liberty, and property. But should such blessings be confined to "the tropics"? Russia is in a sadly backward economical condition; internal administration is very corrupt, liberty is unknown. Would it not be a good thing for England to overrun and conquer and administer the affairs of Russia as a "trustee for civilization"? The idea is not preposterous; Napoleon made the attempt eighty-six years ago, and, had he succeeded, he would have extended his trust and taken in England too.

It by no means follows that because a nation is to-day capable of governing dependencies well, or, on the other hand, incapable, this state of things must continue indefinitely. It is only within the last fifty years that English administration has become so good. Fifty years hence, who can say that this superiority will be maintained? A hundred years ago German government was almost a laughing-stock. To-day German administration and police are of the first rank. Twenty-five years ago the whole Christian world looked upon Japan as unfit to administer ordinary justice according to civilized ideas. To-day Japan is admitted to the family of nations, as a self-governing, equal, and independent Power. Mr. Kidd's argument is really nothing more than this: "We are better and stronger than you, and can manage your property better than you can yourselves; therefore we shall take it from you." This used to be called spoliation; to make it sound moral, Mr. Kidd calls it establishing a "trust for civilization."

Semitic Influence in Hellenic Mythology. By Robert Brown, Jun., F.S.A. London: Williams & Norgate. 1898.

Mr. Andrew Lang, who is himself on the other side of the house, once observed that nothing is so galling to philological mythologists, nothing injures them more in the public esteem, than the charge that their rival etymologies and discrepant interpretations are mutually destructive. Mythologists are a sensitive tribe; and the *odium mythologicum*, a special product of this century, is as bitter as any of those grammatical antipathies which we associate with the savage encounters of the Bentley period of criticism. We may, however, safely assert that in the liveliest passages of the 'Phalaris' dissertation, Bentley failed to compass the colloquialism of Mr. Brown in the work before us. As his title indicates, the author's aim is to insist on the importance of the influence of Egypt and Western Asia on Hellenic mythology; in particular instances he gives detailed evidence of Semitic sources for Greek divinities.

The rival schools of philological and anthropological mythology, as represented by Prof. Max Müller and Mr. Lang, furnish little support to the "Aryo-Semitic" theories of Mr. Brown. Max Müller, with an obstinate prepossession in favor of an Aryan Pantheon, "almost absolutely ignores the vast force and extent of Semitic influence in Hellas" (p. 20). Hence, though Mr. Brown is an enthusiastic advocate for Max Müller's linguistics as opposed to the anthropological theories of Mr. Lang, and devotes some twenty pages to his defence, his admiration is tempered by regret that the Oxford professor refuses to make more concessions than are inevitable in his recognition of Semitic influence. Mr. Brown tells the amazed reader (p. 21) that "Fifty years of strenuous and sagacious effort have placed upon Müller's brow a crown which the whirligig of time will be powerless to remove, let Carp and Pike try their best or their worst," and with that characteristic burst of rhetoric he turns to demolish Mr. Lang. Not even the surprises of the author's style—like Hudibras, he "cannot ope his mouth but out there flies a trope"—can impart interest to the next sixty pages of mythological horseplay. Matthew Arnold said that on an opponent one never does make an impression. Mr. Brown's jocularity, his favorite comments—"Umps" and "Who deniges of it?"—his address to the reader "O vain man," his frequent references to himself as "R. B., Jr.," are in the worst possible taste; nor are his arguments, so far as we have been able to comprehend them, likely to make much impression on his anthropological adversary. Mr. Lang, *ondoyant et divers*, may be trusted to defend himself and his totems in the next edition of 'Custom and Myth.'

The third section of the book is more interesting. In it the author tries to support his claim for Semitic origin or affinities in the case of Heracles, whom he identifies with the Phœnician Harekhal; so Kronos is identified with the Semitic "Horned One"; Athene, Poseidon, Aphrodite, and others are furnished with a Semitic pedigree. In the matter of such Greek and Semitic equations, Max Müller, in his 'Contributions to the Science of Mythology,' has lately remarked that "there is really no evidence to lay hold of and to examine." Where Max Müller fears to tread we have no desire to rush in, and content ourselves with the comment that if Mr. Brown wishes to be intelligible to those who have not access to his evidence, he must rewrite his discussion of the signs of the zodiac and the Homeric constellations; at present they convey such confusion to the mind that "two tablespoonfuls of Lethe water before breakfast" and a fresh start are what we should desire for ourselves before we again consider the question of Semitic influence.

Mr. Brown's industry and learning are undeniable. But that he rides his Semitic hobby too hard is obvious even to those whose wits are not sharpened by mythological controversy. Moreover, there are few causes that would not be damaged by poor rhetoric, confused statement, and persistent abuse of one's opponents.

Il Principe di Niccolò Machiavelli: Testo critico con introduzione e note, a cura di Giuseppe Lisio. Florence: G. C. Sansoni. 1899 [1898].

It seems odd that the classical work of an author whose life fell wholly within the practice of the art of printing should only now have its text critically established. This however, is what has happened to Machiavelli's 'The Prince,' of which the first edition appeared five years after his death. The original manuscript is undiscovered if in existence. The Roman and the Florentine editions of 1532 bear every mark of liberties, rhetorically pedantic and other, taken with the great Secretary's abrupt, tumultuous, and nervously flexible style, and exhibit many variations from each other and from the several manuscript copies preserved. The difficult task of collating all these and the great number of minor and more or less servile imprints (down to 1554 in Italy, when the papal censor prevailed) has been undertaken by Giuseppe Lisio, whose labors have been published in the "Raccolta di opere inedite o rare di ogni secolo della letteratura italiana."

Lisio's introduction fills nearly a third of the handsome volume, and is a fine example of discussion of material, exposition of critical principles, and scholarly judgment. He premises that 'The Prince' has suffered more than all the other works of Machiavelli from unfaithful treatment, and then passes in review the half-dozen sources which compel consideration, and constructs a tentative genealogical tree for them. The nominally first edition printed at Naples in 1523, while Machiavelli was yet living, is not one of these, except to a very limited extent, being a bold working over, in a sort of macaronic Latin. The first editions professing to present the author in his original vernacular, we have already named. What is specially interesting in their infidelities is the schoolmasterly correction of Machiavelli's dialectal forms and Latinisms, transpositions of words and phrases, and other dressings up. Thus, in the dedication to Lorenzo de' Medici, where Machiavelli wrote *"prete* preziose," Antonio Blado (Rome, 1532) prints "pietre," "soggetto" for "subietto," "nondimeno" for "tamen"; interpolates in "con quello [poco] animo"; omits in "io [indegnamente] sopporti"; changes "le quali" into "la quale," with the corresponding participial regimen, etc. Where Machiavelli, in Shaksperian

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fashion, uses France, Spain, England for the sovereign of the respective countries, Blado rounds out "re di Francia," etc. A like polishing was attempted in the nearly simultaneous Florentine edition of the Giunta, which appears to have relied upon a manuscript as well as upon Blado, and became in turn the basis of the numerous Venetian editions from Aldus to Domenico Giglio. The so-called Testina edition (Geneva, undated, but early in the seventeenth century), was arbitrarily eclectic from the foregoing; and, coming down to the present century, the Capolago edition of 1849 was derived from Blado, the Testina and the "Italy 1813"—strange bedfellows, as Lisio remarks; yet, for some unexplainable reason, this was chosen for the text edited by L. Arthur Burd for the Clarendon Press in 1891. Finally, all the more recent popular editions have gone from bad to worse, adding fresh errors of the printing-office to those borrowed from the editors who corrupted the fountain-head.

All this, with the examination and weighing of the manuscripts, makes very interesting reading. Lisio in fairness considers whether Machiavelli did not perhaps revise his work, but concludes that he would have made far more extensive changes had he made any, and in particular would have corrected some anachronisms engendered by the lapse of time. He then lays down the lines of his own reconstitution of the text, and is led into this notable characterization of the two periods of his author's prose, of which the extremes are marked by the 'Lettere' and the 'Principe' on the one hand, and by the 'Istorie' on the other, with the 'Discorsi' and the 'Dialoghi dell' Arte della Guerra' in the middle:

"There is a family air about them, but the individuals are not identical. In the three writings of the first group you will observe the frequent employment of Latin sentences, of Latin conjunctives—remnants of a tiresomely obsolescent court jargon; a quite appropriate number of vigorous Latinisms and idioms in words, phrases, and constructions, a greater license in graphic forms and endings; a vivacity of inversions, elisions, thought constructions, loose references, forcible anacolutha; a more lively and bounding movement of the intellect; a recurrence of the same conceits, frequently incomplete; a cropping up of thoughts not obviously connected—marble blocks roughhewn like Michelangelo's, not finished and polished in Canova's manner. Then if you observe with a sharp eye the latest writings, you will see still the same man, the same writer, but with a spirit (I should say) more tranquil, with garments (I should say) less dishevelled, more orderly. It seems, in fine, that whereas formerly he was more vivaciously Italian in substance and Latin in form, he afterwards became more Italian in form, but more Latin and sometimes lumbering in substance. The streams of thought descend with greater continuity and fluidity; less frequently so-called irregularities mar the often polished surface; idioms and Latinisms, though proudly resistant and enduring to the very last—Latin conjunctives and sentences gradually disappearing—give place to the purest current Italian; and the waves of the period, less uneven, not seldom take on a sonorous amplitude, especially in the 'Istorie.'"

Of no other great writer, then, could it more truthfully be maintained that the style is the man, and that the rectification of his text—above all in that work which has made Machiavelli's reputation hinge upon a personal adjective, become a universal counter of speech in an evil sense—is a pious service to letters and to history. Lisio appends at the foot of every one of his criticically composite pages the variants of the group he has placed under contribution; and in a lower basement, so to speak, he discusses instructively the most noticeable of them, with precious observations on Machiavelli's usage, and with constant revelation of this conscientious editor's grounds of discrimination for or against the locution in question.

Home Life in Colonial Days. By Alice Morse Earle. Macmillan. 1898.

Early in the present century a song was current, extolling the charms of life "In good old Colony times, When we lived under the King." After reading this attractive book, one begins to think that the poet, Tory though he may have been, was not altogether wrong, and that life in those days may have had a certain charm, dignity, and educational value that are wanting in these days of steam, electricity, and the insoluble servant problem. Every household was an abode of cheerful industries; and the young ladies who carded, spun, wove, dyed, knitted stockings, made "brooms of Guinea wheat," and so forth, were no whit the less ladies for that, as Nausicaa was none the less a princess when, with her maidens, she did the palace washing. Nor did it in the least seem degrading drudgery to them. When charming young Abigail Foote, in 1775, in one day, as her diary records, "carded two pounds of whole wool, and felt Nationly," because home manufacture of cloth was one of the steps towards independence, she had as good grounds for her patriotic glow as if she had attended a Woman's Club and signed a string of resolutions.

Every feature of domestic colonial life is here represented; the homes, furniture, and utensils of our ancestors, their occupations, and to some extent their recreations, all minutely described and copiously illustrated, largely from photographs of objects now preserved in museums. One only thing we miss, that most primitive of fire-dogs, made by the local blacksmith out of a single flat bar, split at one end, and ingeniously doubled, bent, and twisted, such as may now occasionally be seen in ancient farm-houses, where it has carried the burning logs for a century or more. The cover of the book, representing such a sampler as our great-grandmothers used to sew in their school-days, is particularly appropriate.

We recommend the study of this volume to those novelists who attempt to revive for us colonial life. He who shows us the lover "kissing Mistress Polly when the clock-reel ticked," will catch a touch of local color that he never could have evolved from his imagination.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Ash, Mark and William. The United States Internal Revenue Laws. Statutes, Decisions, Rulings. Baker, Voorhis & Co. $5.
Belloc, Bessie R. Historic Nuns. London: Duckworth & Co.
Crane, Walter. A Floral Fantasy. Harpers $2.50.
Donohoe, Rev. Thomas. Popular Progress. Buffalo: Murray & Dawson.
Field, Edward. Esek Hopkins, Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Navy. Providence: Preston & Rounds Co.
Gell, Hon. Mrs. Lyttleton. The More Excellent Way. Words of the Wise. Henry Frowde.
Hall, Rev. Newman. An Autobiography. T. Y. Crowell & Co. $3.
Isham, N. M. The Homeric Palace. Providence: Preston & Rounds Co. $1.
King, Rev. J. M. A Critical Study of "In Memoriam." Toronto: G. N. Morang.
Lacour-Gayet, G. L'Education Politique de Louis XIV. Paris: Hachette.
Morris, Charles. Historical Tales. Spanish. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. $1.25.
Peixotto, Ernest. Ten Drawings. San Francisco: A. M. Robertson. $3.50.
Rogers, L. C. French Sight Reading. American Book Co. 40c.
Sayre, T. B. Two Summer Girls and I. New York: G. A. S. Wieners.
Semple, H. C. Hank, and Other Poems. Louisville, Ky.: G. G. Fetter Co.
The American Church Almanac and Year-Book. James Pott & Co.
Wallace, Prof. William. Lectures and Essays on Natural Theology and Ethics. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Henry Frowde.
Willoughby, W. W. The Rights and Duties of American Citizenship. American Book Co. $1.
Ziegler, Prof. Theobald. Die Geistigen und Socialen Strömungen des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. Berlin: Georg Bondi; New York: Lemcke & Buechner.

"No teacher of any grade can possibly afford to go without reading it."—*The Dial.*

VOL. XVII. No. 1. 9TH YEAR

JANUARY

EDUCATIONAL REVIEW

Edited by Professor NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER.

ARTICLES.—The Future of the Normal School, by William T. Harris; Professional and Academic Schools, by R. H. Thurston; Baumeister's Handbuch der Erziehungslehre, by Paul H. Hanus; Sentimentality in Science-Teaching, by Edward Thorndike; Course of Reading for Children, by George Griffith; Educational Value of Biography, by Sadie E. Simons; Study of Education at the University of Texas, by W. S. Sutton.
DISCUSSIONS.—The Use of Higher Education, by T. D. A. Cockerell and William T. Harris; No National University at Washington, by William Hawley Smith.
REVIEWS. EDITORIAL.

$3 *a year (monthly, excepting July and August), 35c. a copy. Contents Vols. I-XV. free.*

HENRY HOLT & CO., N.Y.

HOUSEHOLD BOOKS.

Catering for Two

Comfort and Economy for Small Households. By ALICE L. JAMES, 16mo, $1.25.

"'Catering for Two' will be appreciated by every housekeeper of an economical turn of mind. The recipes are many and all of them are attractive. It is a most useful and valuable little cooking manual and will be of particular service to beginners in the art. It will be found thoroughly satisfactory in every respect."—*Boston Eve. Gazette.*

What One Can Do with a Chafing Dish

By H. L. S. 16mo, $1.00.

Of this very popular little book, nearly 20,000 copies have been sold.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS,
27 & 29 W. 23d St., New York.

A NEW STORY BY MR. HAGGARD.

DR. THERNE.

BY H. RIDER HAGGARD,

Author of "King Solomon's Mines," "The Wizard," "Montezuma's Daughter," etc., etc. Crown, 8vo, cloth, $1.00.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.,
91-93 Fifth Ave., New York.

The Story of Gösta Berling

A Swedish work of great power and beauty, has been received with exceptional favor.

Sold at all bookstores, or sent, postpaid, on receipt of price, $1.75, by the publishers,

LITTLE, BROWN & CO., Boston.

BOOKS FOR SCARCE ONES CONSULT POOR RICHARD'S ALMANACK, gratis. BOX 4037, STATION B, PHILADELPHIA.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED